

The CLASSICAL QUARTERLY and CLASSICAL REVIEW are the organs of the Classical Association. For the present the QUARTERLY will be published in two DOUBLE numbers in April and October; the times of publication of the REVIEW are variable under prevailing conditions.

The Classical Review

PERIODICAL ROOM
GENERAL LIBRARY
UNIV. OF MICH.

Editors C. J. FORDYCE, M.A., 3 The University, Glasgow, W. 2
R. M. RATTENBURY, M.A., Trinity College, Cambridge

ALL COMMUNICATIONS intended for the Editors should be sent to MR. FORDYCE. BOOKS for review should be sent to the Publisher

BOARD OF MANAGEMENT

PROF. R. G. AUSTIN, M.A.
F. H. SANDBACH, M.A. (Hon. Sec.)
PROF. F. W. WALBANK, M.A.
PROF. E. H. WARMINGTON, M.A. (Hon. Treas.)
W. S. WATT, M.A.
N. G. L. HAMMOND, M.A., representing the Cambridge Philological Society

Representing the Council of the
Classical Association

With the co-operation of

PROF. B. D. MERITT, Institute for Advanced Study, Princeton, PROF. J. A. FITZHERBERT, University of Adelaide, and
PROF. HOMER A. THOMPSON, University of Toronto

Volume LXIII

SEPTEMBER 1949

Number 2

CONTENTS

NOTES AND NEWS	41
THEOPHRASTUS, <i>Characters</i> 21. 6. J. D. BEAZLEY	42
PLATO, <i>Republic</i> 368 A. D. J. ALLAN	43
PLATO, <i>Phaedo</i> 115 D. D. TARRANT	44
Ἑλπίς, ἔλπω, ἔλπομαι, ἐλπίζειν. J. L. MYRES	46
LUCRETIVS AND THE LOVE-PHILTRE. L. P. WILKINSON	47
THE DATE OF THE <i>Bellum Punicum</i> . W. BEARE	48
NAEVIUS AND THE <i>Alimonium Remi et Romuli</i> . W. BEARE	49
BAD BRONZE AGAIN. G. THOMSON	49
EURIPIDES, <i>Cyclops</i> 402-4, <i>I.T.</i> 753-4. E. L. B. MEURIG DAVIES	49
ATLAS THE MALIGNANT. A. MACC. ARMSTRONG	50
THE METRICAL TREATMENT OF PROPER NAMES IN STATIUS. O. A. W. DILKE	50
THE FULLER'S EARTHS OF THE ELDER PLINY. R. H. S. ROBERTSON	51
A METELLUS IN TWO PASSAGES OF DIO. A. R. BURN	52

REVIEWS:

Companion to the Pre-Socratic Philosophers (Freeman), W. HAMILTON, 53; *Hippocrate, L'Antienne Médecine* (Festugière), W. H. S. JONES, 54; *Cratinus* (Pieters), M. PLATNAUER, 55; *Dionysius of Halicarnassus*, vol. vi (Cary), A. H. McDONALD, 56; *Pselius, De omnifaria doctrina* (Westerink), J. H. SLEEMAN, 57; *Eternal Lawyer* (Wilkin), H. H. SCULLARD, 58; *Cicero and the Roman Republic* (Cowell), H. H. SCULLARD, 59; *Apulei Metamorphoseon libri iv-vi* (Paratore), D. S. ROBERTSON, 61; *Thucydides and the History of his Age* (Grundy), A. W. GOMME, 62; *La Crète* (van Effenterre), T. J. DUNBARIN, 63; *The Decline of the Roman Empire in the West* (Walbank), E. A. THOMPSON, 65; *A History of Attila and the Huns* (Thompson), A. H. M. JONES, 66; *The Classical Background of English Literature* (Thomson), F. L. LUCAS, 67; *Yale Classical Studies*, x, J. TATE, 69.

SHORT REVIEWS	70
SUMMARIES OF PERIODICALS	75
BOOKS RECEIVED	78

OXFORD : AT THE CLARENDON PRESS

LONDON, NEW YORK, TORONTO, AND MELBOURNE : GEOFFREY CUMBERLEGE

Price 5s. net. Yearly subscription, 16s. net, post free; U.S.A., \$3.40. Combined yearly subscription for the CLASSICAL QUARTERLY and the CLASSICAL REVIEW, 30s. net, post free; U.S.A., \$6.30

Entered as Second Class at the New York, U.S.A., Post Office.

THE CLASSICAL ASSOCIATION

THE objects of the Classical Association are to promote the development and maintain the well-being of classical studies, and in particular (a) to impress upon public opinion the claim of such studies to an eminent place in the national scheme of education; (b) to improve the practice of classical teaching; (c) to encourage investigation and call attention to new discoveries; (d) to create opportunities for intercourse among lovers of classical learning.

Membership of the Association is open to men and women alike. The annual subscription is 5s. (life composition, £3. 15s.). Members receive a copy of the annual *Proceedings* of the Association and, on a payment of 6s., of *The Year's Work in Classical Studies* (both post free). They may also obtain the *Classical Review* and *Classical Quarterly* at reduced prices (*Review* 13s. 6d., *Quarterly* 15s.; combined subscription £1. 5s. 6d.), though the reduction cannot be guaranteed unless the subscription is paid before January 31st in each year. *Greece and Rome* may be obtained for an annual subscription of 10s. 6d.

Applications for membership should be addressed to the Hon. Treasurer, Mr. J. S. Shields, Queen Mary's School, Basingstoke, Hants. Inquiries should be sent to either of the Hon. Secretaries of the Association (Professor L. J. D. Richardson, University College, Cardiff, and Mr. T. W. Melliush, Bec School, London, S.W. 17) or to the Hon. Secretary of any one of the District Branches—viz. Aberystwyth, Bedfordshire, Birmingham, Bristol, Cardiff, East Anglia, Hull, Kent, Leeds, Leicester, Liverpool, London, Manchester, Northumberland and Durham, North Wales, Nottingham, Oxford, Reading, Sheffield, Shrewsbury, Southampton, South-Western, Swansea, Taunton and West Somerset.

in
on
n;
all
ers

al
al
in
nd
p-
on
an

S.
of
ity
on.
g-
on,
rd,
nd

T

Th
Cla
che
wa
dif
Ea
Un
we
che
(th
ev
ren
ha
th
ca
th
to
ho
As
th
U
th
T
(S
ci
ev
m
co
at

a
b
ti
P
M
P
b
P
fi
A
a
P
A
S
C
S
S

THE CLASSICAL REVIEW

SEPTEMBER 1949

NOTES AND NEWS

THE Forty-fifth General Meeting of the Classical Association was held at Manchester from 19 April to 23 April, and was very well attended, in spite of the difficulties created by the lateness of Easter and the consequent clashes with University and school terms. The weather, though cold, belied Manchester's reputation for continuous rain (there were occasional showers, but even Tacitus might have qualified his remarks about the climate of Britain had he been present), and whatever the thermometer said the warmth of a Lancashire welcome entirely compensated the visitors for their trouble in coming to Manchester. The arrangements for housing and feeding the members of the Association were admirably made by the officers of the local branch, of the University, and of Ashburne Hall, and the whole meeting was a great success. The Vice-Chancellor of the University (Sir John Stopford) received the Association at a conversazione on the first evening; and the Lord Mayor (Alderman Mary Kingsmill Jones) gave a reception for the President and members at the Town Hall on the last evening.

The Presidential Address on 'Classics and Politics' was given by Lord Soulbury and was followed by the Association Dinner. Papers were read by the Provost of King's on 'The Garden of the Muses: a Chorus from the *Medea*'; by Professor R. G. Austin on 'The *Georgics*'; by Mr. J. A. Davison on 'The Quest for Homer'; by Dr. O. Skutsch on 'Reflections on the Fragments of Ennius' *Annals*'; by Dr. J. B. Skemp on 'Plato and the Argument from the Arts'; by Professor W. H. Semple on 'Rhetor *Emeritus*: a Study of the *Confessions* of St. Augustine'; by Professor Michael Grant on 'The Bases of the Augustan System'; and by Professor W. Bedell Stanford on 'Ulysses from Homer to

Joyce'. An exhibition of Greek Art in the Whitworth Art Gallery was described by Miss Helen Thomas. The last morning was devoted to 'Communications', which must now be accepted (with sincere gratitude to those who initiated the experiment) as an integral part of the annual meeting. Contributions were made by Dr. Günther Zuntz on 'The Etymology of the Name Σαπφώ'; by Mr. O. A. W. Dilke on 'The Value of the *Codex Etonensis* of Statius' *Achilleid*'; by Mr. H. Ll. Hudson-Williams on 'Political Speeches in Athens'; by Mr. A. N. Marlow on 'Early Influences on the Poetry and Scholarship of A. E. Housman'; by Mr. W. R. Smyth on Propertius i. 1. 11-12, and were discussed as thoroughly as time allowed. At the Business Meeting, which followed, Professor H. M. Last was elected President for 1949, and an invitation to hold the next annual general meeting at Bristol was gratefully accepted. It was also announced that a one-day general meeting would be held in London in January.

Two excursions were arranged. One party visited the Roman fort and museum (now under the care of the National Trust) at Ribchester; the guide was Dr. I. A. Richmond. The second party visited Lyme Hall, under the guidance of Mr. H. F. Guite. One evening was devoted to a performance, by members of the University Classical Society, of the *Heauton Timoroumenos* in Latin, with music specially composed by Mr. A. N. Marlow. This was greatly enjoyed by the large audience, who also admired the new Arthur Worthington Hall of the University, in which the performance was given.

The discussion which forms a regular part of the annual meeting was on the Classical Background in Modern Schools and Emergency Training Colleges, and

was presided over by Mr. A. J. D. Porteous, Professor of Education in the University of Liverpool.

The Association were very happy to welcome as their guest Dr. Robert Muth of the University of Innsbruck, editor of the recently founded *Anzeiger für die Altertumswissenschaft*.

The *Oedipus Coloneus* of Sophocles will be performed in Greek by members of the University at Cambridge on 21, 22, 23, 24, 25 February 1950.

The *kátharsis* of the *Poetics* has been the occasion of much perplexity and the subject of much discussion, but no scholar has so far hit upon the simple expedient of removing the word. That is the solution put forward by Dr. M. D. Petruševski in the first volume of the *Annuaire* of the Faculty of Philosophy (Historical and Philological Section) in the University of Skopje, which has just reached us from Yugo-Slavia. On the grounds that this, as it stands, is the only part of the definition of tragedy which

Aristotle does not elaborate, he rejects *παθημάτων κάθαρσην* as an interpolation and proposes to read *παγγυμάτων σύστασιν*. In another article Dr. D. Koco gives an account of the discovery of the remains of two ninth-century churches under a mosque at Ochrid in southern Serbia.

Gnomon, which ceased to be published in the middle of 1944, came back to life at the beginning of this year. It appears under the direction of Professors Erich Burck of Kiel, Matthias Gelzer of Frankfurt, and Friedrich Matz of Marburg, with Professor Walter Marg of Kiel as editor in charge. Publication has been taken over by Biederstein of Munich; there will be eight numbers a year, but for the first year they will be combined in four double numbers. Besides some eighty pages of reviews Heft 1/2 contains classified lists of recent books, notes on forthcoming German publications, and an address-list of classical scholars in Germany and Austria.

THEOPHRASTUS, CHARACTERS, 21. 6

IN *B.C.H.*, 1946, pp. 172-8, Professor Charles Dugas publishes an Attic squat lekythos, from the first half of the fifth century, with a picture of a bird wearing a crested helmet and holding a spear and a shield. He shows that the bird is probably meant for a lark, *κορυδός*, *κορυδαλλός*, which has its Greek name from its 'helmet', *κόρυς*: the crested lark (*Alauda cristata*) is commoner in southern Europe than the skylark (*Alauda arvensis*) and has a more conspicuous crest (D'Arcy Thompson, *Glossary of Greek Birds*, p. 164). Dugas compares a small red-figured mug ('oinochoe shape 8') in the Louvre (Le Lasseur, *Les déesses armées*, p. 353; *B.C.H.*, 1946, p. 177, fig. 8), where an owl carries spear and shield and wears a pair of helmet-crests.

This reminds one of what Theophrastus says about the man of small ambitions (*Char.* 21. 6) who 'buys a little ladder for his pet jackdaw and makes him a little bronze shield to hop with on

the ladder': καὶ κολοιῶ δὲ ἔνδον τρεφόμενῳ δεινὸς κλιμάκιον πρίασθαι, καὶ ἀσπίδιον χαλκοῦν δ' ἔχων ἐπὶ τοῦ κλιμακίου ὁ κολοῖός τηθήσεται. 'Like a soldier on a scaling-ladder at the taking of a city', according to Edmonds. One might also think of acrobatic performances like that depicted on a black-figured amphora of Panathenaic shape in the Cabinet des Médailles (243 Salzmänn, *Néc. de Camire*, pl. 57; *C.V.*, pl. 88 and pl. 89. 1-2): see *Bull. van de Vereeniging*, June 1939, pp. 11-12.

Moriz Haupt was the first to bring a detail of a red-figured acorn-lekythos into connexion with the passage in Theophrastus (*A.Z.*, 1886, *Anz.*, p. 215). The vase is in Athens (1284: *C.C.* 1941), and had been published by Otto Jahn in 1865 (*Ueber bemalte Vasen mit Goldschmuck*, pl. 1. 1-2): it is florid Attic work from the end of the fifth century, not very remote from the Meidias Painter, but hardly so close that it could be included among the vases in his manner.

The subject may be the meeting of Paris and Helen, but this is not certain, and what concerns us is the small bird on the ground near one of the Erotes, who is much interested in it. The bird alone is figured, from a more accurate drawing by Robert Zahn, by Studniczka in the 1897 Leipsig edition of the *Characters* (*Theophrasts Charaktere*, p. 166, with text pp. 168-9). A tiny shield, ἀσπίδιον, is fastened to the left wing, and the head is adorned with a big helmet-crest. Studniczka thought that the crest was perhaps natural, but the new vase rather suggests that it is artificial. The bird is not of the same sort as in the new vase: with its plump shape and bugled eye it makes one think of a robin, but the species cannot really be determined.

It would be a pity to pass over, even if one cannot explain, the enigmatic

figure on an Italiote skyphos of Gnathian ware, still fourth-century, in Berlin (3517: *Jh.* xxxii, p. 30). The creature that stalks along, armed with spear and shield, has the body and legs of a bird, a wader, but human head and phallus. The long cadaverous face is like a caricature of Don Quixote; large ears, horns. The monogram on the shield, *M* and *E* in ligature, ought to give the clue. Gerhard though of Metapontum; Hafner (*Jh.* xxxii, pp. 29-31) recalled the companions of Memnon who were transformed into the birds called μεμνονίδες, which according to a legend preserved by late writers fought each other every year above the tomb of their master; I have sometimes thought of Menelaos.

J. D. BEAZLEY.

Oxford.

PLATO, REPUBLIC 368 a

καὶ ἐγὼ ἀκούσας δὲ μὲν δὴ τὴν φύσιν τοῦ τε Γλαῦκωνος καὶ τοῦ Ἀδεϊμάντου ἡγάμην, ἀτὰρ οὖν δὴ καὶ τότε πάνυ γε ἥσθη καὶ εἶπον· Οὐ κακῶς εἰς ὑμᾶς, ὦ παῖδες ἐκείνου τοῦ ἀνδρός, τὴν ἀρχὴν τῶν ἐλεγείων ἐποίησεν ὁ Γλαῦκωνος ἐραστής, εὐδοκμήσαντας περὶ τὴν Μεγαροῦ μάχην, εἰπών·
'παῖδες Ἀρίστωνος, κλεινοῦ θεῖου γένος ἀνδρός'.

ADAM remarks: 'This curious phrase occurs once again in Plato, viz. *Phil.* 36 d, where Protarchus is addressed in the words ὦ παῖ ἐκείνου τάνδρός. Philebus has withdrawn from the discussion, his part in which he has bequeathed to Protarchus, who is therefore playfully called his son. . . . In precisely the same way Glauco and Adeimantus are the children of Thrasymachus. They are διαδόχοι τοῦ λόγου, as appears from 357 a, 358 b (etc.), as well as from the substance of their arguments. This image is, in fact, one of the links by means of which Plato binds the dialogue together: as Polemarchus is heir to Cephalus (331 e), so Glauco and Adeimantus are heirs to Thrasymachus.'

Jowett and Campbell, however, dismiss this explanation as ridiculous, and refer the ἐκείνος to Ariston, whose name immediately follows and is connected with the phrase by the repetition of the word παῖδες. 'What the passage of the

Philebus really proves is that this was a familiar mode of address amongst intimate friends.' Tucker translates 'sons of an illustrious sire', comparing the Latin *illius*, and apparently seeing an ironical reference to Thrasymachus.

The commentators on the *Philebus* have not been much more successful in explaining their passage. For them the problem is complicated by an earlier enigmatic reference at 16 b: οὐ γὰρ οὖν, ὦ παῖδες, ὡς φησιν ὑμᾶς προσαγορεύουν Φίληβος. Diès at 36 d translates: 'O fils d'un tel homme', which seems meaningless.

Surely there is a much simpler answer to all this. Iamblichus (*V.P.* 88; Diels, *V.S.* 8. 4); after recounting the story that Hippasus was drowned at sea for revealing a geometrical construction, continues: . . . εἶναι δὲ πάντα ἐκείνου τοῦ ἀνδρός. προσαγορεύουσι γὰρ οὕτω τὸν Πυθαγόραν καὶ οὐ καλοῦσιν ὀνόματι. The phrase, then, is a variant of the more celebrated αὐτὸς ἔφα.

Obviously it is to this practice of the Pythagoreans that Plato alludes. In the *Republic* the venerable person who may not be named is the father of Glaucion and Adeimantus—his own father, Aris-

ton. In the *Philebus*, 'that man' is the unknown original from whom the fictitious character Philebus is drawn—very probably Eudoxus, whose hedonism was based on the same arguments as that of 'Philebus', and who had formerly been associated with the Italian Pythagoreans. He may have used ὦ παῖδες as a form of address to his pupils, and this would explain the allusion at 16 B. I admit that on this view the explanation given is not uniform; Ariston is a real father, whereas it is only in argument that Philebus is the father of Protarchus. But I do not think we can refer ἐκεῖνος in the *Republic* to Thrasy-machus, while retaining the Pythagorean allusion; the difficulty is that he is *present*; there is no mystery about him.

There are, in fact, two elements in the explanation: (1) the Pythagorean usage, and (2) the practice of inheriting an argument in debate, which must have been familiar in Socratic circles, leading to the facetious use of the phrase ὦ παῖ. At *Philebus* 36 d these two elements are present together; at *Republic* 368 d only the first is present, and ὦ παῖδες is used in its proper sense. It is an accident that the metaphor of 'inheriting' an argument had been previously used in the *Republic*. It may be added that Plato only once named Pythagoras (*Rep.* x. 600 b)—he is, of course, the 'Prometheus' mentioned at *Philebus* 16 c.

D. J. ALLAN.

University of Edinburgh.

PLATO, *PHAEDO* 115 d

οἰχῆσθαι ἀπὼν εἰς μακάρων δὴ τινὰς εὐδαιμονίας.

THE purpose of this note is to amplify my suggestion (*C.Q.* xlii, 1948, p. 31) that this sentence is ironical in tone, and to suggest further that the phrase μακάρων εὐδαιμονία may be semi-proverbial.

The style and atmosphere of the context are markedly informal. At 115 a Socrates has dismissed myth and returned to the facts of his own position, with the final realistic phrase μὴ πράγματα ταῖς γυναιξὶ παρέχειν νεκρὸν λούειν. At this, Crito asks for parting instructions. Socrates' reply brings in a clear reminiscence of the *Apology*, with no doubt a play on colloquial usage, in the phrase ὑμῶν αὐτῶν ἐπιμελούμενοι (cf. *Ap.* 30 a-b, 36 c). Crito's question about burying him is answered with a combination of amusement—γελᾶσας δὲ ἅμα ἡσυχῇ—and complete realism, and the language here shows several colloquial touches. καὶ ἐρωτᾷ δὴ (actually) πῶς με θάπτῃ. ὅτι δὲ ἐγὼ παλαι (all this time) πολλὸν λόγον πεποίημαι, ὥς . . . οἰχῆσθαι ἀπὼν . . . ταῦτά μοι δοκῶ αὐτῷ ἄλλως λέγειν. οἰχῆσθαι ἀπὼν is echoed at 115 e, οἰχῆσθαι ἀπὼντα. οἶχομαι with a participle has frequently a colloquial or mock-tragic effect, as in *Phaedo* 98 b, ὥχόμεν φερόμενος, *Phil.* 13 d ἐκπεσὼν

οἰχῆσται. μοι δοκῶ is another informal usage of conversation: cf. *Rep.* 336 d καὶ μοι δοκῶ . . . ἄφρονος ἂν γενέσθαι, *Prot.* 340 a δοκῶ οὖν μοι ἐγὼ παρακαλεῖν σε, *Theaet.* 183 d ἀλλὰ μοι δοκῶ . . . οὐ πείσεσθαι αὐτῷ.

Socrates continues with a jest which imports another reminiscence of the *Apology*—ἐγγυᾶσθε οὖν με κτλ. (cf. *Ap.* 38 a-b).

It is in this context and setting that we find the phrase εἰς μακάρων δὴ τινὰς εὐδαιμονίας.

The words δὴ τινὰς are ignored by some translators (e.g. Jowett, Church) and editors. Burnet finds the phrase 'mysterious', as at 107 d. The point in Robin's rendering is not very clear: 'je m'en irai vers des félicités qui doivent être celles des Bienheureux'. Denniston (*Greek Particles*, pp. 212 f.) observes two senses of δὴ τις, corresponding respectively to *aliquis* and to *quidam*. Under the first he cites *Phaedo* 107 d, 108 c, *Rep.* 521 c; under the second, some examples from tragedy (e.g. Eur. *I.T.* 526) as conveying 'a meaning air of mystery'. The present instance appears under 'further examples', leaving its allocation uncertain. At Ar. *Birds* 652 the point seems to be a quotation given for what it is worth—ἐν Αἰσώπου λόγοις |

ἐστὶν λεγόμενον δὴ τι, τὴν ἀλώπεχ', ὡς κτλ. δὴ alone is also used in irony (e.g. *Laws* 962 e πρὸς τὸν ἐλευθέρον δὴ βίον ὠρμημένη), in quoting, again maybe with irony, words of the other speaker (*Gorg.* 508 d τὸ νεανικὸν δὴ τοῦτο τοῦ σοῦ λόγου κτλ.), and with τὸ λεγόμενον in citing a proverb (*Gorg.* 514 e τὸ λεγόμενον δὴ τοῦτο, ἐν τῷ πύθω τὴν κεραμεῖαν ἐπιχειρεῖν μανθάνειν (cf. Denniston, pp. 234 ff.)).

To come to μακάρων εὐδαιμονίας, μάκαρ is used by prose writers only in the plural and always with reference to 'the blessed dead' (L. and S., s.v.), and by Plato except for the present passage only in the phrase μακάρων νῆσοι. This expression is as a rule used seriously, but at *Rep.* 519 c there is an ironical application—ἡγούμενοι ἐν μακάρων νήσοις ζῶντες ἔτι ἀπωκίσθαι. Otherwise Plato uses the form μακάριος, often in the established and common phrase μακάριος καὶ εὐδαίμων, and usually with serious meaning. μακάριος can, however, be ironical, as in the form of address ὦ μακάριε (e.g. *Prot.* 309 c), or again combined with a colloquialism at *Rep.* 567 e, ἡ μακάριον . . . λέγεις τυράννου χρῆμα. The usage ἐς μακαρίαν in imprecation (not found in undisputed works of Plato) suggests again a playful or ironical sense of the word which would make the euphemism appropriate; the three examples are *Ar. Knights* 1151 ἀπαγ' ἐς μακαρίαν, *Hipp. Ma.* 293 a βάλλ' ἐς μακαρίαν, and *Antiph. Incert.* 9 ἐς μακαρίαν τὸ λουτρόν.

εὐδαίμων can also be ironical in conversational use, e.g. *Rep.* 422 e εὐδαίμων εἶ, ἦν δ' ἐγώ, ὅτι οἶε ἄξιον εἶναι κτλ. There are, further, some instances in the *Republic* in which a familiar or proverbial use in the ironical sense may be suspected—612 a αἱ νῦν . . . περιπέφυκεν ὑπὸ τῶν εὐδαιμόνων λεγομένων ἐστιάσεων, 420 a εὐδαίμονες δοκοῦντες εἶναι, 476 c τῶν πλουσίων καὶ εὐδαιμόνων δοκούντων εἶναι. A similar usage appears at 404 d with εὐπαθεῖται—Ἀττικῶν πεμμάτων τὰς δοκούσας εἶναι εὐπαθείας.

At *Rep.* 612 a Adam translates 'in consequence of these "happy" feastings as they are called'. The distinction between λεγόμενος in agreement, as meaning merely 'alleged' or 'much

talked of', and τὸ λεγόμενον, as introducing a proverb, seems a questionable one. A case in point is *Theaet.* 176 b ταῦτα γάρ ἐστιν ὁ λεγόμενος γραῶν ὕθλος . . . τὸ δὲ ἀληθές ὡδε λέγωμεν. Campbell renders 'what men commonly repeat, an old wives' fable' (cf. Jowett, 'only a repetition', etc.), and supports this ordinary sense of the verb by λέγωμεν following. But such a play is appropriate to any sense of λεγόμενος, and γραῶν ὕθλος seems to bear the mark of a proverb. (For γραῦς as a teller of tales cf. *Lys.* 205 d, *Gorg.* 527 a, *Rep.* 350 e; for ὕθλος, *Lys.* 221 c, *Rep.* 336 d.) Again, at *Theaet.* 173 d, οἱ τῆς θαλάττης λεγόμενοι χόες is surely proverbial, and indeed appears to be so taken by Campbell, following Stallbaum. It is in any case difficult to draw a hard line between the two meanings; see e.g. *Laws* 782 c, Ὀρφικοὶ τινες λεγόμενοι βίοι. What is 'commonly quoted' can easily become proverbial.

The remarkable parallel between *Phaedo* 115 d and *Ar. Frogs* 85 gains in point if both μάκαρες and εὐδαιμονίαι are capable of an ironic and semi-proverbial meaning. The whole passage in the *Frogs* is of course mock-tragic in tone.

85-7. *HP.* Ἀγαθὸν δὲ ποῦ ὅστιν; *ΔΙ.* ἀπολιπὼν μ' ἀπολίσσεται.

HP. ποῖ γῆς ὁ τλήμων; *ΔΙ.* ἐς μακάρων εὐωχίαν.

The παραπροσδοκίαν for Μακεδόνων is obvious. The use of εὐωχία, conveying very material 'bliss', suits the context.

If, then, μακάρων εὐδαιμονίαι may reasonably be taken as a piece of ironical and perhaps semi-proverbial usage, its appearance here in the *Phaedo* is fully consistent with the informal, colloquial, and light tone of the context, in which a serious use of the words would be out of place. Socrates has finished with sublimities and has returned to his own characteristic lines of talk (cf. the reference to τὸ μὴ καλῶς λέγειν, 115 e), and he now speaks of his own future in terms strongly reminiscent of the ironical and tentative mood of the closing pages of the *Apology*.

DOROTHY TARRANT.

Bedford College, London.

Ἐλπίς, ἔλπω, ἔλπομαι, ἐλπίζω

It has been tempting, and customary, to render these words into English by *hope*, as in Ephesians ii. 12 (A.V.). But this word does not quite express the meaning of the Greek, as a consideration of passages of all periods will show.

In the *Odyssey* (ii. 91: xiii. 380, never in the *Iliad*) the active verb ἔλπω is 'give reason to expect', as Penelope gave to the suitors. Accordingly the middle ἔλπομαι, common in both poems, is 'give oneself reason to expect', and the active perfect and pluperfect have this middle sense. Though 'wishful thinking' is not excluded, purely rational estimation of probability is the normal sense; as Nausicaa says to Odysseus (*Od.* vi. 297) αὐτὰρ ἐπὶν ἡμέας ἔλπη ποτὶ δώματ' ἀφίχθαι. This is exactly the δόξα μελλόντων of Plato, *Laws* 644 c, and is the regular meaning in Herodotus, who uses ἔλπομαι 9 times, and the Attic ἐλπίζω 29 times, both of present and future affairs: ἐλπίζω also of past expectations, almost always erroneous—if the occasion arose—but always reasonable in themselves (οἰκότα i. 77, viii. 10). Powell, *Lexicon to Herodotus*, s.v., (i. 'suppose, implying error') is not quite exact: in vii. 157 the occasion did not arise: in viii. 60 Themistocles adds the phrase beginning οἰκότα μὲν νῦν βουλευομένοισι, and Themistocles was right.

Herodotus uses ἔλπομαι to designate his own conclusions, in geology (ii. 11), climate (ii. 26), legend (ii. 43, 120), and expressly equates it (ii. 43) with ἡ ἐμὴ γνώμη αἰρέει; for the reasonable conclusions of others (vii. 237) whether fulfilled (i. 113) or not (vii. 218): in vi. 109 the contingency did not occur. There is never any suggestion of 'hope' in the modern sense: in i. 65 the Pythia *knows* what she was saying: ἐλπίς is rational throughout.

This is in accord with the usage of Pindar and of the Tragedians:

Nem. vii. 20 (29) ἐγὼ δὲ πλέον' ἔλπομαι λόγον Ὀδυσσεὺς ἢ πάσαν διὰ τὸν ἀδυσπῆ γενέσθ' Ὀμηρον.
fr. 50 (Bowra) τί ἔλπει σοφίαν ἔμμεν & τ' ἄλγον τοι ἀνὴρ ὑπὲρ ἀνδρὸς ἴσχει;

Compare Democritus' contrast between

φύσις and ἐλπίς (fact and conviction: Diehls, *fr.* 13. 176: cf. 58. 185. 292) and Critias' commendation of wine (*fr.* 4. 15 D.)

ὥστε φρέν' εἰς ἱαράν ἐλπίδα πάντας ἄγειν.

Tragic usage is quite uniform—ἐλπίς τις αὐτὸν ἤξειν Aesch. *Ag.* 679; but ἐλπίς may be miscalculated—πολλῶν ῥαγευσῶν ἐλπίδων (Aesch. *Ag.* 505); τὸ μηδαμὰ ἐλπισθὲν ἤξειν Soph. *O.C.* 1105.

But in Thucydides a new sense of 'putting trust in' appears: ii. 89 Πελοποννησίων τὴν ἐλπίδα τοῦ ναυτικοῦ; iii. 14 αἱ τῶν Ἑλλήνων ἐς ὑμᾶς ἐλπίδες; iii. 97 τῇ τύχῃ ἐλπίσας, where the expectation is by implication ill founded. And this implication becomes stronger in time: *Trag. Aesop.* 118. 2 ὅστις ἐλπίζει θεοῦς . . . χαίρειν ἀπαρχαῖς.

In Early Christian writers both senses occur, and it becomes important to distinguish them. With Thuc. iii. 97 we must compare ἐλπίζω ὀνόματι Matth. xii. 21 (εἰς τίνα John v. 45; ἐπὶ τινι Rom. xv. 12; ἐπὶ τίνα 1 Peter iii. 5), inherited from ἔλπω. ἐν τινι LXX 4 Ki. xviii. 5; πρὸς τι Judges xx. 36. Such belief may be well or ill founded, so it be sincerely held. But in Rom. xv. 13 ὁ θεὸς τῆς ἐλπίδος personifies ἐλπίς as rational belief, coupled with πίστις in 1 Cor. xiii. 7 πάντα πιστεύει, πάντα ἐλπίζει, and in Rom. iv. 18 ὃς παρ' ἐλπίδα ἐπ' ἐλπίδα ἐπίστευσεν. It is this 'assurance' that the old world lacked: (Eph. ii. 12) ἐλπίδα μὴ ἔχοντες καὶ ἄθεοι ἐν τῷ κόσμῳ; cf. οἱ μὴ ἔχοντες ἐλπίδα· εἰ γὰρ πιστεύομεν κτλ. It is rational, like ἐλπίς of Herodotus founded on ὄψις, ἀκοή, and γνώμη; and the reasonable expectation of the farmer ἐπ' ἐλπίδι ὁ ἀροτριῶν ἀροτριᾷ καὶ ὁ ἀλοῶν ἐπ' ἐλπίδι τοῦ μετέχειν. What had befallen the old world was a 'failure of nerve' (as Murray calls it in *Four Stages of Greek Religion*); the loss of anything on which to base expectation; for humanism had run to seed. All this is very far from the 'hope' of our translators.

JOHN L. MYRES.

Oxford.

LUCRETIVS AND THE LOVE-PHILTRE

DR. CYRIL BAILEY in his *Lucretius* devotes several pages (vol. i, pp. 8-12) to a discussion of the controversy over Jerome's famous entry under the year 94: 'Titus Lucretius poeta nascitur, postea amatorio poculo in furorem versus, cum aliquot libros per intervalla insaniae conscripsisset, quos postea Cicero emendavit, propria se manu interfecit anno aetatis XLIII.' About the love-philtre and the madness at least he gives reasons for scepticism, but there is one further reason for scepticism that I have not seen adduced.

In the last paragraph of his life of Lucullus (43) Plutarch writes as follows: *Νέπως δὲ Κορνήλιος οὐχ ὑπὸ γήρως φησὶν οὐδὲ νόσου παραλλάξει τὸν Λούκουλλον, ἀλλὰ φαρμάκοις ὑπὸ τινος τῶν ἀπελευθέρων, Καλλιθέου, διαφθάρντα· τὰ δὲ φάρμακα δοθῆναι μὲν, ὡς ἀγαπῶτο μᾶλλον ὁ Καλλιθένης ὑπ' αὐτοῦ, τοιαύτην ἔχειν δοκοῦντα τὴν δύναμιν· ἐκστῆσαι δὲ καὶ καταλῦσαι τὸν λογισμὸν, ὥστ' ἔτι ζῶντος αὐτοῦ τὴν οὐσίαν διοικεῖν τὸν ἀδελφόν.* And Pliny, discussing noxious plants (*N.H.* xxv. 25), recalls *Lucillum . . . amatorio periisse*. K. Ziegler, in his extensive discussion of the whole question,¹ mentions these two passages, but only to emphasize the *argumentum ex silentio* against the tradition, pointing out that Nepos mentions the death of Lucretius (*Atticus* 4. 12) without any reference to a love-philtre, and that Pliny fails to mention Lucretius along with Lucullus, though they died within a few months of each other and the poet must have been a much more interesting person in his eyes—one of the sources he names of his Book X.²

Is it not probable that Jerome or his source, by a trick of the eye or memory, confused LUCRETIVS with LUCULLUS? (It is extremely unlikely that the mistake was the other way round, that the story was

transferred from Lucretius to Lucullus; for Nepos was flourishing at the time of Lucullus' death, and even if he did not hear the story at the time, he would hardly have set it down afterwards without checking it by questioning the many surviving intimates of Lucullus.) The upholders of the traditional story assume, with most scholars, that Jerome's source was Suetonius, who, they maintain, was scrupulously careful in the collection of his facts. But was he? It is generally agreed that the story he relates towards the end of his short life of Horace about the poet having mirrors arranged round his bedroom rests on just such a confusion between the similar-looking names HORATIUS and HOSTIUS; Seneca (*N.Q.* i. 16) gives a circumstantial account of the apparatus erected by one Hostius, who also lived under Augustus. Moreover, in the very first sentence of that life Suetonius attaches to Horace a story that certainly belongs to a third-century character whom the mind for various reasons associates with him, Bion the Borysthenite.³

The matter is of real importance. Scholars with the prestige of Lachmann and Masson have accepted the love-philtre and the madness, and Tennyson's eloquent poem has canonized the traditional story. It makes such a dramatic pendant to the attack on love in Book IV that many who accept without question the suggestion that a natural confusion of names can clear Horace's reputation of an imputation they think discreditable may be loath to allow a similar reason to deprive the Lucretian legend of its most colourful feature. But it is a pity if readers approach the *De Rerum Natura* with a predisposition to look for signs of madness in the author, and to find them even in objective references to common human symptoms such as occur at i. 132-3 (delirium and nightmares), iii. 828-9 (insanity, loss of

¹ *Hermes*, lxxi (1936), p. 425; Bailey, vol. i, p. 9, n. 11.

² He might, however, have been expected still more to mention Caligula, whose wife was said to have driven him mad by a love-potion (Suet. *Caligula* 50).

³ Diog. Laert. iv. 46; Auct. ad Herennium 54, 67; see R. Heinze, *De Horatio Bionis Imitatore*; G. C. Fiske, *Lucilius and Horace*, p. 316.

memory, and depression), and iv. 33-7 (hallucinations and nightmares). Lucretius naturally adduces any phenomenon that strengthens his argument; his men-

tion of it need have no reference to his personal experience.

L. P. WILKINSON.

King's College, Cambridge.

THE DATE OF THE *BELLUM PUNICUM*

Cic. *De Sen.* 50: quam gaudebat bello suo Punico Naevius! quam Truculento Plautus! quam Pseudolo!

THIS passage is universally understood to mean that the works mentioned in it were written in old age. Cicero is putting into Cato's mouth an account of the pleasures proper to old age—in particular the leisure it gives for study. 'si uero habet aliquod tamquam pabulum studii atque doctrinae, nihil est otiosa senectute iucundius.' It is true that his first example is the astronomer C. Gallus, whose studies were of a most laborious kind. Still, the words which follow might quite naturally be taken to mean that Naevius and Plautus enjoyed *reading* their favourite works in their old age. Next comes a reference to Livius Andronicus (*uidi etiam senem Linium*), which does not say that he was still writing when an old man, but that he was a dramatist who lived to a ripe age.

The didascalia to the *Pseudolus* indicates that the play was produced in 191—by which date Plautus was in all probability an elderly man, as *Cist.* 202 shows that he had begun his dramatic career before the end of the Hannibalic war. Nevertheless I doubt whether Cicero is thinking of the date of composition of the *Pseudolus*, the *Truculentus*, or the *Bellum Punicum*. These were famous works, written by contemporaries of Cato—and one of Cicero's objects in this discourse attributed to Cato is to show that literary pleasures may be enjoyed in old age. What more natural, in such a context, than to dwell on the pleasure which Plautus and Naevius derived when old from their own writings? Yet this assertion may be as

fictitious as the rest of the discourse. What evidence on such a matter was available to Cicero? If we know anything about Naevius, his *senectus* was not at all *otiosa*. Plautus tells us (*Bacch.* 214) that he liked his *Epidicus*, at least when it was acted properly, and there may conceivably have been similar references to the *Pseudolus* and the *Truculentus* in other plays. But who can suppose that Plautus made one of his characters observe to the public 'elderly though the poet is, he has greatly enjoyed writing the play which you are now about to see', or 'which you saw last year'?

The dates of the early Latin writers were in Cicero's day, as Cicero admits, a matter of controversy (*Brut.* 72). It may be that no records had survived except the text of the authors and the didascaliae of some plays. For Naevius' birth a *terminus ante quem* was given by his statement in the *Bellum Punicum* that he had served in the war; this statement was quoted by Varro, who in turn is quoted by Gellius (xvii. 21. 45). There was controversy as to the date of his death (*Brut.* 60). The date of Plautus' birth is nowhere recorded; he died, according to Jerome, in 200: according to Cicero, in 184 (*Brut.* 60). On such matters Cicero's factual statements may be right or wrong; but the remark attributed by him to Cato is of a different character, and should not be taken as evidence that the *Bellum Punicum* was written in old age, when Naevius was presumably in disgrace, a prisoner or an exile.

W. BEARE.

University of Bristol.

NAEVIUS AND THE ALIMONIUM REMI ET ROMULI

DONATUS, *ad Ter. Ad.* 537, after offering two explanations of the phrase *lupus in fabula*, adds 'nam falsum est quod dicitur interuenisse lupum Naeuianae fabulae alimonio Remi et Romuli, dum in theatro agitur'. Does this mean that Naevius wrote a separate praetexta dealing with the infancy of Romulus, or was this the same praetexta as that entitled *Romulus* which is mentioned by Varro (*L.L.* vii. 54)? It seems to me that neither of these alternatives should be adopted. Donatus is merely refuting an absurd theory (which one almost suspects him of inventing). Since *fabula* can mean 'play' as well as 'story', 'fable', the phrase *lupus in fabula* could

be taken to have originally meant 'the wolf in the play'. The question would then arise—what was the play in which a wolf might be supposed to have appeared? The mention of a wolf might suggest the infancy of Romulus, and Naevius had written a praetexta dealing with Romulus. But to explain the phrase in this way would, as Donatus very rightly says, be false. The only value of the passage is to confirm indirectly the statement of Varro that there was a play of Naevius which had Romulus as its hero.

W. BEARE.

University of Bristol.

BAD BRONZE AGAIN

IN *C.R.* lix. 52 Mr. D. E. Eichholz and Professor T. A. Sinclair have criticized my interpretation of Aesch. *Ag.* 390-3 κακοῦ δὲ χαλκοῦ τρόπον τριβῶ τε καὶ προσβολαῖς μελαμπαγῆς πλεῖα δικαιωθείς (*C.R.* lviii. 35), the former on the ground that it is technically impossible. I deferred my reply in order to obtain expert advice, and now offer the following comments after consulting a Greek goldsmith.

Mr. Eichholz wrote: 'It was not the touchstone which marked the gold, but on the contrary the gold which marked the touchstone.' That is true, so far as the lydian stone is concerned. There was a confusion in my note on this point, and I am grateful for the correction.

But how does he translate Theogn. 449-50 εὐρήσεις δὲ με πᾶσιν ἐπ' ἔργμασιν ὥσπερ ἀπέφθον χρυσόν, ἐρυθρὸν ἰδεῖν τριβόμενον βασάνῳ? The last four words must surely mean 'red to look at when rubbed with the touchstone'. Here it is the mark left by the stone on the gold that is inspected, not the mark left by the gold on the stone.

The colour of impure gold varies according to the alloy. Mixed with copper, it is reddish; with silver, whitish; with nickel, greenish. When the lydian stone is used, the colour of the metal proper, as distinct from any dirt with which it may be encrusted, appears as a thin streak adhering to the stone, which being black throws it into relief. This method has the additional advantage that the stone can be marked previously with a streak of pure gold to serve as a standard of comparison. But the true colour of the metal will also appear on the metal itself if it is rubbed with any object hard enough to remove superficial dirt. This is only a rough-and-ready test, but quite practicable, and I suggest that this is what both Theognis and Aeschylus had in mind.

The colour of impure gold is not necessarily darker than that of pure gold; it is simply different. Therefore the idea of μελαμπαγῆς is not taken from

gold-assaying. Professor Sinclair explains it as follows: 'If bronze or copper or brass is bad, polishing and hammering will reveal impure streaks of black.' This is technically correct, but it involves three difficulties. It is doubtful whether προσβολαῖς can mean 'hammering'; the idea of bad bronze as a symbol of unrighteousness is without parallel in Greek poetry; and, as he admits, μελαμπαγῆς is left without point in relation to the man.

It seems that my interpretation is the only one that does justice to μελαμπαγῆς.

GEORGE THOMSON.

University of Birmingham.

TWO NOTES ON EURIPIDES

Cyclops 402-4

καὶ ἡ καθαρπάσας†
λάβρω μαχαίρα σάρκας ἐξώπτα πυρὶ,
τὰ δ' ἐς λέβητ' ἐθήκεν ἐθεσθαί μελῃ.

I suggest keeping καθαρπάσας and reading μάχαιραν. It seems not essential for Euripides to specify the cutting up. For the corruption cf. 394 κλάδῳ LP for κλάδων Scaliger, *Rhes.* 126, Ar. *Ach.* 23 ἀωρίᾳ Suid. for ἀωρίαν codd. et Phryn.: conversely, *Hel.* 981 θηράν LP for θηρά Canter, *Or.* 1187, *Phoen.* 166, *I.A.* 567, *Soph. Tr.* 831, Ar. *Av.* 1620 μισητίαν vulg. for μισητίᾳ Suid. λάβρω now goes with πυρὶ: cf. *Or.* 697. Is λάβρος anywhere applied to a weapon? For καθαρπάσας μάχαιραν cf. *Andr.* 1122, Eur. *El.* 819.

I.T. 753-4

Πν. ἄκουε δὴ νῦν ὃν παρήλθομεν λόγον.

Ἰφ. ἀλλ' αἰθὺς ἔσται καινός, ἣν καλῶς ἔχη.

I propose ἀλλ' εὐθὺς ἔστω καινός (καινός Markland). For καινός cf. *Hippol.* 609, *Tro.* 53-4, *Or.* 1098, *I.A.* 44: εὐθὺς, αἰτὸς are variants at Ar. *Av.* 377: apogr. Paris. gives ἔστω for ἔσται at Eur. *Supp.* 1191: for the sentiment cf. *Tro.* 717-18.

E. L. B. MEURIG DAVIES.

ATLAS THE MALIGNANT

WHY Homer should title Atlas *ἀλοόφρων* was a puzzle even in antiquity, as is evident from *Σ* on *Od.* i. 52 ff., the enigmatic passage in which Calypso is called

Ἀλάντος θυγάτηρ ἀλοόφρονος, ὅς τε θαλάσσης
πάσης βένθεα οἶδεν, ἔχει δέ τε κίονας αὐτὸς
μακράς, αἱ γαῖαν τε καὶ οὐρανὸν ἀμφὶς ἔχουσι

'the daughter of malignant Atlas, who knows the depths of the whole sea and himself upholds the tall pillars which hold earth and sky apart'.

Apart from the desperate expedients of taking *ἀλοόφρονος* with *θαλάσσης* and of reading *ἀλοόφρων*, on the supposition that someone had come across a text written in the ancient manner without distinction between *ω* and *ο* and wrongly added the *ος*, it was proposed to read *ἀλοόφρονος*, to mean *τοῦ περὶ τῶν ὄλων φρονούντος*. The received view, however, was that the word meant *ἀλεθρίος* 'destructive' and referred to Atlas' hostility as a Titan to the gods. This interpretation is supported by the other Homeric passages in which the word is used, for in the *Iliad* it is applied to the snake that bit Philoctetes (ii. 723), to a lion attacking cattle (xv. 630), and to a furious wild boar (xvii. 21), and in the *Odyssey* to Aeetes (x. 137), i.e. the king who planned to destroy the Argonauts, and to Minos in connexion with Theseus (xi. 322), i.e. in his destructive aspect. The explanation offered, however, is not satisfactory, for it is doubtful whether the story of Atlas' fight with the gods is as old as Homer, since even Hesiod mentions Atlas' task only as a lot (*μοῖρα*) put on him by Zeus (*Theog.* 520), and what is required is to show how the epithet could apply to Atlas when he is engaged in holding up the sky.

According to Gladstone (*Homeric Studies*, vol. i, p. 224) the word merely means 'hard, rigid, inexorable; or astute, formidable to cope with, one who takes merciless advantage'. Butcher and Lang translate 'wizard', in accordance with a hint *καὶ γὰρ μάγος ἦν* by *Σ* on x. 137, the Aeetes passage. The ground for this translation is that primitive peoples regard a clever man as having something uncanny about him, a wizard being etymologically 'one who knows'. But why should a word which to start with signifies destructive-mindedness come to denote simply wisdom?

These attenuations are superfluous, for the plain meaning is quite suitable. Atlas is the poetical transfiguration of a cloud-capped mountain, and a mountain is destructive-minded when it is volcanic. The Moroccan Atlas is not in point, for Greek knowledge of the West was interrupted when Carthage sealed off the West at the end of the sixth century, and Strabo betrays his utter bewilderment by his statement that the Atlas mountain is the whole range extending through Mauretania from the west coast to the Syrtes (826). According to Strabo and Pliny (*Nat. Hist.* v. 13) the native name of the Moroccan Atlas was Dyrus or Diris (the Berber *Idrarn*), and probably the identification of it with the Homeric Atlas was nothing more than an unhappy conjecture made after the reopening of the West. R. Hennig has revived the old suggestion of Ideler that the Homeric Atlas is the Peak of Tenerife, for Atlas is

connected in Hesiod and Homer with the Hesperides and Ogygia, and must seem to rise straight from the sea for it to be said that he knows the depths of the sea (*Terrae Incognitae*, vol. i, pp. 36 ff.). Hennig himself translates 'des Allerforschenden', but his theory is strengthened by the translation 'malignant', for the Peak of Tenerife is volcanic. It erupted in 1909 and was evidently more active in earlier ages.

A. MACC. ARMSTRONG.

THE METRICAL TREATMENT OF PROPER NAMES IN STATIUS

IN two passages of the *Achilleid* containing adjectives formed from names of towns Garrod (Oxford text) differs from the reading of all the manuscripts in one case and of P in the other. Lines 84 f. of Book I read:

quem tu illic natum Sigeo in pulvere, quanta
aspicies victrix Phrygiarum funera matrum!

Garrod adopts the suggestion of Lachmann on *Lucr.* iii. 374, to avoid such elisions in Greek words, *natum in Sigeo pulvere*. But Statius has *Ephyreo* (or *Ephyraeo*) in *littore* at *Theb.* vi. 253, *Nemeao in pulvere* x. 499; while *Theb.* x. 254 *Phoebea insignia*, which Lachmann would emend, is not even an example of his 'rule', for it has an elision that would have been permissible in Greek (he himself says: 'Nihil tamen causae fuit cur in Graecis Graeca elisione absternerent'). In *Verg. Aen.* vi. 505 *Rhoeteo in littore* has as good manuscript authority as *Rhoeteo littore*. Furthermore *natum in Sigeo* gives a very poor caesura.

At *Ach.* i. 151 f. P (by far the best manuscript) has:

nunc illum non Ossa capit, non Pelion ingens
Pharsaliaeve nives.

KQ have *Thessaliaeve nives*, which Garrod adopts, and E *Thessaliae iuvenes*. In *C.R.* xxviii (1914), 67 Garrod rebuked Brinkgreve for printing *Pharsaliae* on the ground that it is unmetrical with short -*al-*; but Brinkgreve says nothing about the quantity, and is simply following Klotz, who scans -*iae* by synizesis (cf. *Philologus*, lxi. 295 f.). That synizesis is allowable in proper names is shown by *Ov. Met.* xv. 178 *et spissi litoris Antium*, where likewise many manuscripts have variants for *Antium* designed to simplify the scansion.¹ *Thessaliae* here will have arisen as a gloss on *Pharsaliae*, and then been substituted to help the metre.²

¹ Cf. *Hor. Od.* ii. 7. 5 *Pompei meorum prima sodalium*; *Sat.* ii. 8. 1 *ut Nasidieni iuvit le cena beati*? In Catull. lxiv. 178 *Idomeneosne* is generally accepted as a correction of *idomeosne* or *Idmoneosne*.

² Postgate in *C.R.* 1905, 260 couples this passage with Cat. lxiv. 37 and Calp. Sic. iv. 101, calling them 'this trio of cripples' which 'a number of scholars have propped back to back in the hope of retaining the position'. But whether *Pharsalam* in the Catullus passage is defensible or not (Ellis defends it as quadrisyllabic rather than with synizesis), Catullus' metrical peculiarities have little bearing on those of Statius. In Calp. Sic. iv. 101 Heinsius's conjecture *Parrhasiae* should be accepted.

Bährens's conjecture *Pharsali* is not only unnecessary but would refer to the immediate neighbourhood of Pharsalus, which is hardly mountainous.

Possible parallels are the adjectives *Edonus* or *Edonius*, *Boeotus* or *Boeotius*. Although *Edonus* is the usual form, and is read by modern editors, the better manuscripts are unanimous in reading in *Theb.* v. 78

dulcius Edonias hiemes Arctonque prementem
excipere,

where Servius' reading *tristius Edonas hiemes Hebrumque nivalem* is obviously unreliable as quoted from a very poor memory; and in *Theb.* xii. 733

ce u pater Edonios Haemi de vertice Mavors
impulerit currus

the manuscripts have: *Edonios* (PBKQ), *edomitos* (SNL: cf. iv. 652 *edomito* . . . *ab Haemo*, where Markland conjectured *Edono*; there, too, *Edonio* would be closer), *Edonos* (codd. dett.). If the better manuscripts are right, we may either scan *Edónias*, -os with synizesis or consonantal -i-, or *Edónias*, -os, comparing *Edónis* in Lucan i. 675, Sil. iv. 778 (*Edónis* in Propertius and Ovid).

At *Theb.* vii. 100 f. *Boeotia* (adj.) has the normal scansion. At *Silv.* v. 3. 209 Bährens conjectured *Boeotaque (tempe)* for M's *biotaque* or *luoacque*.¹ At *Theb.* iv. 360, P, the Puteaneus, has *Boeotiis* (*urbibus*), Q *Boeciis* (-eci- in ras.), others *Boeotis*; and at vii. 424 f. P has *Boetiaque ventum* | *flumina*, others *Boeotaque* or *Boeotaeque*. These are the only occurrences of the adjective in Statius. In the last two passages² editors give the forms from *Boeotus*; but may we not here too agree with P?

Other peculiarities of Statius' scansion have a bearing on the above. Apart from the customary examples of synizesis (such as *Tydeo*, *semianimis*, *anteire*, *alveo*) and contraction (*Vesevus* and *Vesivus*, *repostus*, *replictus*) we find:

(1) Treatment of -ui-, -ua. *Tenuis* normally has the regular scansion, but at *Theb.* v. 597 and vi. 196 *tenuia ossa*, *tenuia ora* scan *ténui(a)*; at *Theb.* xii. 2 and *Silv.* i. 4. 36 we have *cornu tenuiore*, *tenuiore lyra*; while at *Theb.* iv. 697 P has *tenuis*, the other manuscripts *tenuior* or *tenuis*; and at *Ach.* i. 239 (senior P, *tenuis* EKQ) Postgate plausibly conjectured *tenuior*. *Patruis* is disyllabic in *Theb.* iv. 429. *Fortuito* in *Theb.* vii. 449 can, as in other poets, be considered to scan either as three syllables or with -iit-; in *Silv.* i. 6. 16 *gratútum* is so scanned. *Genua* in *Theb.* viii. 156 has consonantal -u-. *Huic*, on the other hand, is disyllabic³ in *Silv.* i. 1. 107; i. 2. 135; *Theb.* viii. 459 (so P).

(2) Treatment of compounded *de-*, *re-*, *prae-*. *Deesse*, *deerat*, and *deeris* are always scanned as two syllables; but Klotz seems right in retaining the reading of most manuscripts⁴ in *Theb.* viii.

¹ See Klotz, 2nd ed., p. lvi and app. crit.

² And in *Ov. Met.* xii. 9, where the manuscripts vary between *Boeotaque tellus*, *Boetiaque tellus*, and *Boeotia tellus*.

³ For examples of this rarity elsewhere see *Thesaurus* s.v. 'hic' (pron.).

⁴ The variants, which are clearly designed to simplify are -que *deest* and *iam deest* in *Theb.* viii.

236, x. 236, xi. 276, so as to scan *dēst*. There seems also no reason to alter, with Garrod, *prāteiret* in *Theb.* vi. 519 and *dēire*⁵ in *Theb.* ii. 551. *Dehinc* is monosyllabic in *Ach.* i. 370, and with the reading of PS in *Theb.* ii. 100, but elsewhere disyllabic, while *dein*, *deinde* always have synizesis. *Reicit* in *Theb.* iv. 574 is either disyllabic (as *reice* Virg. *Ecl.* iii. 96) or an anapaest, as *adici* in *Theb.* vii. 4.

(3) At *Theb.* ii. 492 all the manuscripts have *crebris arietibus*, which Klotz retains, scanning *āriētibus*. It is doubtful whether the reading of P in *Theb.* x. 527 *trabibusque et ariete sonoro* (que above the line, dots under *et*) can stand; it is unlikely on metrical grounds rather than, as Klotz suggests, because *aries* as an instrument of war is an anachronism.⁶

Thus it will be seen that Statius not infrequently departs from the scansion used by his predecessors; and that the scribes are very apt to emend such examples of irregular scansion.

O. A. W. DILKE.

University College, Hull.

THE FULLER'S EARTHS OF THE ELDER PLINY

IN Book xxxv of his *Natural History* Pliny describes how several sorts of fuller's earth were used in the laundering of clothes. The passage is not clear unless one can identify the earths discussed, and the word *saxum* has hitherto defied translation. Paragraphs 196 to 198 are here given in Professor K. C. Bailey's version.⁷

196. 'Cimolian creta has another use, too—the whitening of clothes. The kind which comes from Sardinia, and is called *Sarda*, being employed only for white garments and useless for coloured ones, is the least valuable of all kinds of Cimolia. The Umbrian sort and the one they call *saxum* are more highly prized.'

197. '*Saxum* has the property of increasing in bulk when soaked in water and is purchased by weight, whereas Umbrian is sold by measure. The only use of Umbrian creta is for imparting lustre to garments. . .'

198. 'This routine, therefore, must be observed: the garment is first washed with *Sarda*, then fumigated with sulphur, and finally scoured with Cimolian creta, provided that the dye is fast, for bad dye is detected by this procedure and blackens, and its colour is destroyed by sulphur. On the other hand, the valuable fast colours are softened by Cimolian creta, which freshens and brightens hues which have been dulled by sulphur. If the garments are white, it is better to follow the sulphur by *saxum*, but this cannot be used with colours. Instead of Cimolian earth, the Greeks used the gypsum of Tymphaea.'

236; *neque deest*, unmetrically, x. 236; *desunt*, *defit*, and *deest nunc* in xi. 276.

⁵ Defended by Gronovius; *deeo* occurs only here and in *Sall. frag. hist.*, ed. Maurenbrecher, iii. 96 A 11.

⁶ For a similar anachronism cf. *Ach.* i. 422 *murorum tormenta Pylas Messenaeque tendunt*.

⁷ K. C. Bailey, *The Elder Pliny's Chapters on Chemical Subjects*, vol. ii (1932).

Saxum was given as 'chalk' by early translators, but Professor Bailey in a note ingeniously suggests 'burnt rock lime', since this material is hard and rock-like, swells in water, attacks colours, and removes excess sulphur and sulphur dioxide. He assumes that Pliny erroneously included lime among the *cretae* or natural white earths and chalks and states that this error was not uncommon in ancient writings.

But was Pliny wrong? There is a detergent clay called bentonite which has the property of swelling to many times its original volume if a dry lump is placed in water. The dried lumps of the clay are quite hard and could reasonably be termed *saxum* in the trade, especially if the other earths were more friable or powdered. It is also natural that the lump earth *saxum* should be weighed out for sale and that the softer Umbrian earth should be sold by measure.

English fuller's earth, first worked by the Romans,¹ and bentonite both consist essentially of the clay mineral montmorillonite. This mineral has the property of cation exchange. Bentonite is largely sodium montmorillonite and fuller's earth of the Surrey sort is calcium montmorillonite. Both, when rather pure, have a high affinity for basic colours; most dyes used in Pliny's time would be removed by treatment with fuller's earth. The expensive Tyrian purple, which is similar to indigo, is a fast dye and clothes dyed with it could safely be cleaned with the best fuller's earth.

The suggestion that *saxum* is really the first record of bentonite is strengthened by the fact that bentonite has been worked commercially in Italy on Ponza Island near Naples since 1935. Fuller's earth can be converted into the soapier mineral bentonite by the addition of alkali carbonate: this mixture was first recorded by Aristophanes (*Frogs* 713).

It would appear that *Sarda* must have been a fairly strong fuller's earth or calcium montmorillonite, as it was used only for white garments.

There is no difficulty in identifying Umbrian earth as a member of the kaolinite group of clay minerals. These clays do not possess to any marked degree the quality of absorbing grease from wool or of acting as a detergent like soap, and would not therefore be used in the fulling process: but they have the property of adhering to the fibres of cloth, and the glistening crystals of kaolinite give lustre or whiteness to fibrous materials, as in pipe-clayed webbing or china-clay-filled paper. The Romans whitened their clothes in this way, especially before making public appearances; hence the word *candidati*.

The difficulty is not now to identify *saxum* or *Umbrica* but the kind of earths which were used for cleaning clothes dyed with fugitive dyes. They may have been marls or clays containing only a small proportion of the active mineral montmorillonite.

Pliny uses the term Cimolian *creta* in a generic sense to cover all the earths used in the fulling

industry; the original clay from the island of Cimolos, now Argentieri, consists mainly of calcium montmorillonite.

Fuller's earth has been found in Pompeian fulleries. It would be interesting to identify the clay-minerals in this material and to rediscover the deposits of clays worked in antiquity.

ROBERT H. S. ROBERTSON.

A METELLUS IN TWO PASSAGES OF DIO (C.R. lxii, p. 59)

No one who has made any study of the lugubrious annals of the Roman Civil Wars will have the slightest doubt that Mr. Crook is right as against the editors of Dio, whose unanimity is a sad case of 'historians repeating each other'. The only Metellus whom contemporaries or Romans of subsequent generations could bracket with Marius, Sulla, and Pompey was Pius (P.-W., Caecilius, no. 98). It may be worth while, however, to point out that Mr. Crook's case is even stronger than he makes it. In addition to the distinctions which he mentions, Metellus Pius was almost certainly emperor before he was consul (see Klügmann, *Zeitschr. für Numismatik*, viii. 68); he was also pontifex maximus, a dignity which he gained probably at the time of Sulla's victory, and in which he was followed by Caesar (Plut. *Caes.* 7. 1); but the most striking and the most neglected feature of his career is that between 87 B.C. and the return of Sulla he never ceased to 'keep the flag flying' on behalf of the optimate cause, first in Africa (Livy, *Ep.* lxxxiv; Plut. *Crassus* 6), whither he retired from Rome (Plut. *Marius* 42), and, when dislodged from there, in Liguria (Appian, *Civil Wars*, i. 80)—following in the footsteps of Mago in an almost equally dark hour for his side. Like Pompey, he then joined Sulla, not as a refugee but with an army, and moreover *cum imperio*: *μεθ' ἑσέως οὐμπραχίας, ἀνθ' ὧντος ἐν ὧν* (App., l.c.). In 82 he was the optimate commander in the Po valley as Sulla's colleague, not his subordinate (App. i. 81). His defeat of Norbanus and Carbo at Faventia, crowning a succession of other victories (App. i. 87-92), was one of the decisive battles of the war, and Sulla did him no more than justice in taking him as colleague in the consulship. Subsequently against Sertorius he campaigned, it seems, with at least as much success as his independent though junior colleague, Pompey (cf. App. i. 110; Plut. *Sertorius* 19, 21, 22), and lives, or deserves to live, in the saying of his reported by that good soldier Sextus Iulius Frontinus (*Strategemata*, i. 1. 12). One of his young officers had asked him which way he proposed to march next day. 'If my shirt could tell you', replied Metellus, 'I'd burn it.'

Metellus' name in his own days must have been constantly mentioned along with those of Pompey and Sulla; while under the Empire, in addition to Dio's references, it is certainly he whom Spartan brackets with Trajan, Hadrian, and Scipio Aemilianus (*Hadrian*. c. 10, apropos of Hadrian's sharing the hardships of his troops). The reason for his relative lack of renown in modern times is not difficult to see. It arises directly from his loyalty to the aristocracy to which he belonged. 'Homo sanctissimus modestissimisque omnium', as Cicero

¹ George E. Fox, 'Notes on Some Probable Traces of Roman Fulling in Britain', *Archaeologia* (1905), lix (2nd series, ix), 207-32.

says (*Pro Archia* 9), he disdained (as Mr. Crook points out) the ways of a Pompey or a Crassus. Consequently his life made less of a 'story' than theirs; and so, unlike Sulla, Pompey, Crassus, and even Sertorius, he was passed over by Plutarch. He may

not be *ignotus*, but he has certainly been doomed to unmerited obscurity, *caret quia vale sacro*.

A. R. BURN.

University of Glasgow.

REVIEWS

THE PRE-SOCRATICS

Kathleen FREEMAN: *Companion to the Pre-Socratic Philosophers*. Pp. xiii + 486. Oxford: Blackwell, 1946. Cloth: 25s. net.

No comprehensive book in English on the Pre-Socratics has appeared since Burnet's *Early Greek Philosophy*, which, for all its merits, is open to severe criticism on many points, and there is great need of a fresh survey of the whole field, which shall take account of the most important recent work and organize the material coherently so as to exhibit the main lines of development. The announcement of Miss Freeman's book naturally aroused expectations of this need being filled, and it is disappointing to find that she has adopted a plan which greatly diminishes its usefulness both for students and for more mature scholars. It appears from the preface that the former are the class whom Miss Freeman has chiefly in view, and it will be fairest to estimate the value of her work as a manual for undergraduates.

The book is described more accurately by its sub-title as a companion to Diels's *Fragmente der Vorsokratiker*. Miss Freeman states at the outset that for knowledge of the sources 'every student goes to the admirable collection of Diels', and her method is to comment on the vast mass of material in Kranz's revision of Diels section by section, and to use the numeration of Diels-Kranz as the sole means of reference. To proceed thus is surely to proceed on a radically mistaken assumption. To almost all undergraduates Diels-Kranz is accessible only in a library, and even when it is accessible it is, for them, not the most suitable source-book; the earlier sections of Ritter and Preller's *Historia Philosophiae Graecae* are, as Burnet

rightly saw, far more useful, and it is a cardinal defect of the book under review that it cannot serve at all as a guide to the original sources unless the reader has Diels-Kranz constantly before him.

Miss Freeman's method is attended by another serious disadvantage. It compels her to encumber her book with a mass of relatively unimportant detail which inevitably obscures more important issues. Many pages are filled with what amounts to little more than paraphrase of the testimonia about a host of figures such as Nessas and Bolus, but nowhere does one find a clear statement on such fundamental matters as the distinction between Ionian and Italian types of philosophy (though there is a note on the influence of temperament upon philosophical systems on p. 96), or the central and unique position held by Parmenides in the whole history of Pre-Socratic thought. A list of authorities with biographical notes which occupies some thirty-five pages is much less useful than a shorter critical account of the filiation and trustworthiness of the more important sources would have been, and does not justify the claim made for it that it helps the reader to assess the value of conflicting testimony.

'In order not to disturb the exposition of the main theme' as much controversial matter as possible has been relegated to comparatively rare footnotes. But the very nature of the subject makes such a method futile. Where so much has to be supplied by conjecture and interpretation of the sources in order to make the fragments of philosophical systems intelligible, it is impossible to write helpfully even for elementary students without constant reference

to modern critical work. In many places Miss Freeman is driven by her method into an appearance of dogmatism which is not even modified by a footnote. It is stated, for example, without qualification that Anaximander posited the existence of innumerable worlds, that Heraclitus believed in the periodical destruction of the universe by fire and in the survival of the individual soul, and, most surprising of all, that, when Anaxagoras says that there is a portion of all things in everything, 'it is clear from the fragments that by "things" in this connection he means qualities'. An uninformed reader is given no means of knowing that any of these highly doubtful statements has ever been so much as challenged.

There are a good many minor inaccuracies, but enough has been said to show that this is not a book which can safely be recommended to undergraduate classical students, still less to students ignorant of Greek, in whose interests all

Greek quotations have been kept out of the text. Yet it would be unfair to say that it is altogether without value. Miss Freeman's industry is enormous, and she is successful in giving a straightforward account of those figures, such as Xenophanes and the earlier Sophists, whose thought is relatively simple, and about whom the tradition is fairly clear. She is perhaps at her best in dealing with mathematical questions. Her book will be useful to scholars as a work of reference in consulting Diels-Kranz, particularly with regard to the lesser-known thinkers and documents, for which it performs much the same function as a Loeb translation, but lack of critical method and of sense of proportion has prevented it from achieving its principal aim, and we have still to wait for a successor to Burnet in this generation.

W. HAMILTON.

Trinity College, Cambridge.

ANCIENT MEDICINE

A. H. FESTUGIÈRE: Hippocrate, *L'Ancienne Médecine*. Introduction, Traduction et Commentaire. Pp. xxxii + 79. Paris: Klincksieck, 1948. Paper, 300 fr.

THIS is a good piece of work. Though short, it is fairly complete, and shows that the editor has at his command all the scattered evidence bearing on his task; the *apparatus criticus*, however, is rather thin, and some textual problems are treated not very adequately or even omitted entirely.

The introduction of 32 pages gives in beautifully clear language the historical setting of *Ancient Medicine*; the translation is accurate and idiomatic, and the explanatory notes are fullest where the real difficulties are greatest.

Ancient Medicine is perhaps the most interesting work of Greek science. Professor A. E. Taylor wrote (*Varia Socratica*, p. 214): 'The *Περὶ ἀρχαῆς ἱητρικῆς* is . . . of the first importance for the whole history of Greek Philosophy, so important indeed that no one who has not made a study of it should be esteemed competent to speak or write

on the subject. It supplies us with the key not only to the conception of "hypotheses" which is fundamental for the understanding of the *Phaedo* and *Republic*, but to the Platonic conception of the connexion of pleasure and pain with ἀναπλήρωσις and κένωσις, and to the "Aristotelian" doctrine of the "mean". The truth of this statement is not affected by the perhaps extravagant interpretation Taylor put on the certainly astonishing language of chapter 15. One sentence, however, of this chapter (οὐ γὰρ ἔστιν αὐτοῖσιν ἐξευρημένον αὐτὸ τι ἐφ' ἑωυτοῦ θερμὸν ἢ ψυχρὸν ἢ ξηρὸν ἢ ὑγρὸν μηδενὶ ἄλλω εἶδει κοινωνέον) is so Platonic in its phraseology, though not in its meaning, that the reader is both startled and worried. M. Festugière devotes no less than seven closely printed pages of notes to showing by ample quotations that of the phrases αὐτὸ ἐφ' ἑωυτοῦ and μηδενὶ ἄλλω εἶδει κοινωνέον 'l'emploi "technique" dérive très normalement de l'usage ordinaire'. But Plato was so wont to derive his technical terms from 'l'usage ordinaire' that we are still puzzled to

discover why three expressions so reminiscent of the Ideal Theory should occur together in one short sentence. Perhaps the conjunction, strange as it is, is just a matter of chance. M. Festugière deals fully with the difficulties of chapter 20, suggesting aptly that Plato, *Laws* I. 638 c is an imitation of *πονηρόν ἐστι βρῶμα τυρός κ.τ.λ.*, but fails to note what an important link such an imitation would form between Plato and the *Corpus Hippocraticum*. He also fails to appreciate fully the great difficulties that are involved in the words *ὀλως ἀκρητος κ.τ.λ.*, which follow almost immediately.

On the whole the editor is perhaps too

cautious. He sets out the arguments for and against without venturing to suggest a tentative solution, or possibly tentative solutions; but such guesses, even when wrong, are often the cause of another inquirer's reaching the true answer.

The reviewer, who published an edition of *Ancient Medicine* three years ago, has a personal reason for being grateful to M. Festugière. He criticizes the reviewer on several occasions, and careful revision of the passages concerned shows that the criticisms are probably right in every case.

W. H. S. JONES.

St. Catharine's College, Cambridge.

CRATINUS

J. T. M. F. PIETERS: *Cratinus*. Bijdrage tot de geschiedenis der vroeg-attische comedie. (Dissertationes inaugurales Batavae ad res antiquas pertinentes, volumen tertium.) Pp. xii + 222. Leiden: Brill, 1946. Paper, fl. 6.

THIS book (which is usefully furnished with an *abrégé* in French) is, as far as we know, the only full-length study of Cratinus which has yet appeared. Indeed, except for the publication by Mazon and Norsa-Vitelli of the important papyrus fragments of the *Πλούτοι*, and for a few articles such as that by Méautis (*Rev. des Ét. Anc.* 1934) on the *Dionysalexandros*, little has come out on Cratinus since Körte's masterly article in Pauly-Wissowa (1922).

In his first chapter P. deals with the life and character of the poet. Taking Cratinus to have been about forty years of age at the time of the *floruit* given him by Eusebius (454/3), he puts the date of birth as 495. This is certainly more likely than Meineke's 520 and possibly than Körte's 485. Incidentally, if it is right, it makes it even more certain that the Cratinus referred to at Ar. *Ach.* 849 ff. is not the comic poet. Rightly regarding the reference to C.'s 'death' in Ar. *Pax* 700 ff. as a joke, P. puts that event as about 420. The second chapter contains a short résumé of the *Corpus Cratineum* and deals with citations of the poet's works in the pages of later grammarians and encyclopaedists. In

the third chapter, on the authenticity of the plays, P. rightly sides with Körte against Capps's highly improbable, indeed impossible, attribution of the *Némeois* to the younger Cratinus; but he is unlikely to convince many in his attempted reattribution of fr. 66, 69, 70 (K.) to the 'Eumenides' of C. Such a title, unknown elsewhere in comedy, is in itself very unlikely; and Meineke's correction of *Εὐμένειον* to *Εὐνειδαίς* is hardly disputable. P. believes (chap. iv) that the plural titles of so many of C.'s comedies point to the method of composition of the chorus in these plays, some of which he thinks (following Zieliński) had a double chorus; e.g. that of the *Ὀδυσσοῆς* would be made up of twelve companions of Odysseus and twelve Cyclopes; that of the *Ἀρχιλοχοί* of twelve lyric and twelve epic poets. He makes out a good case for this hypothesis, citing the parallel of the *Lysistrata*. In the fifth chapter, dealing with the structure of C.'s comedies, P. advances the strange theories that (1) the Aristophanic parabasis was developed out of an older anapaestic parodos, and further that (2) certain of C.'s plays dispensed with a prologue and started (as do the *Supplices* and *Persae* of Aeschylus) with the parodos. He thinks that this latter 'fact' is hinted at in the remark of the *Ανων. περὶ κωμωδίας* (Kaibel, p. 7) *κατασκευάζων εἰς τὸν Αἰσχύλον χαρακτῆρα*. The first of these two

theories seems to us not susceptible of proof, or, admittedly, of disproof, in view of the meagre fragments at our disposal; but the second, whether right or not, receives no real support from the *Anon.* *περὶ κωμ.*, who is clearly talking of C.'s style, not his dramatic construction.

After assessing (chap. vi) the place and importance of C. in the history of Old Attic comedy P. goes on to discuss (chap. vii) the relations of the poet with Pericles. This chapter contains much interesting and helpful comment on the new fragments of the *Πλοῦτοι*, including the attractive suggestion that at l. 15 of Norsa-Vitelli fr. 1 we should read *ἰ[σόν]* for the editors' *ἰ[μίν]*. He gives a qualified approval to Rutherford's suggestion (*C.R.* xviii. 440) *περὶ δῶν ποιήσεως* in the hypothesis to the *Dionysalexandros*. Chapter viii is concerned with C.'s relations to other poets, and contains valuable matter on the con-

tents and dating of his comedies. C.'s religious and ethical views are dealt with in chap. ix, which contains, besides a full discussion of the *Dionysalexandros*, a greatly improved version of the difficult fr. 74 (K.) of the *Thraittai*. The two following chapters (x and xi) treat of the style, language, grammar, and metre of C. and contain various emendations of the fragments. In his final chapter (xii) P. defends C. against the charge of ultra-conservatism levelled at him by Bergk, and against that of moral indifferentism brought by Jaeger. Certainly the attentive reader of the fragments will not miss in Cratinus the *παιδαγωγική παρρησία* which Marcus Aurelius attributed to Old Comedy.

The book is full of good things and is indispensable for the student of the early comic drama.

M. PLATNAUER.

Brasenose College, Oxford.

THE LOEB DIONYSIUS

Dionysius of Halicarnassus, *Roman Antiquities*. With an English translation by Earnest Cary, Ph.D., on the basis of the version of Edward Spelman. Vol. VI: Books IX (25-71) and X. (Loeb Classical Library.) Pp. 372. London: Heinemann, 1947. Cloth, 10s. net.

WORKING on Jacoby's text and Spelman's translation, with brilliant contributions from Capps and Post, Cary has excelled himself in this volume. Most striking is the correction *βουλῆς* for *φυλῆς* at ix. 44. 7, where earlier editors have thought rather of the *comitia centuriata*: the context, referring to patricians, admits the easy *βουλῆς*. Capps is neat with *ὁ γε* at x. 16. 3 and *θωμούς* at x. 16. 4 and (in Cobet's style) gives smoother syntax with *ὦν* at ix. 39. 3 and *οὕτω σαφῶς* at x. 49. 5; Cary is right in doubting his *ἐνεκα καιρῶν οἱ κατὰ καιρὸν* for *καιρῶν* in *πολιτεύματα καιρῶν* at ix. 37. 2. Post emends well with *δοῦναι τι* at ix. 52. 5, *εἶτα* at x. 12. 2, and *κατασκήσαντες* at x. 16. 5, less convincingly (though Cary accepts) with *βελῶν ἀποτοξεντῶν* at ix. 63. 4 and *ἀφθόνοις* at x. 45. 2; Cary might perhaps have followed Post's *μάχην* at x. 37. 4.

Cary himself emends attractively with

εἰπέ τι at ix. 57. 6 and the addition of *δέ* at ix. 65. 3; after *ἐργαστήρια* at ix. 60. 5 *πλήρη* is easier than his *πληθύνονθ'* (despite ix. 71. 1). He adds *μόνους* at x. 49. 1, assuming that Dionysius remembered the *Ilcii* were plebeian, and reads *μετέχωσι* at x. 55. 4 for technical accuracy. Wisely he avoids transposition at ix. 42. 1 and resists Capps's *εἰάν* in keeping the awkward but natural change of subject at x. 45. 4; at x. 53. 4 Cobet's transposition of *ἐκκυμαιομένων γάρ*, which he accepts, seems the best correction. At x. 54. 4, by reading *ποιήσεν* without *δέ*, Cary improves a cumbrous sentence but may be wrong in shifting the stress from *πρῶτον ἀποδείξαι*.

Cary suspects the coincidence of *εἰ καὶ μηδὲν ἄλλο* and *εἰ καὶ μηδεὶς ἄλλος* in ix. 30. 2 and brackets the second *τὰ λοιπά* at x. 10. 5: in either case he may press a natural repetition too far. In view of the long debates described he may be right in reading *ἐκφέροντες* ('publishing') rather than Kiessling's *εἰσφέροντες* ('introducing') in connexion with *ἀρχὰς κακῶν* at x. 13. 6 and *διατριβάς* rather than, say, Cobet's *ἐρίδας* at x. 15. 6; but both changes would be acceptable. The

omission of *καί* after *ἐγκρατεῖς* at ix. 5. 6 (following Post) eases the sentence: Cary might for similar reasons have omitted *καί* before *μέχρι παντός* at ix. 52. 6 (following Smit) and *καί* before *τὸν γεωμωρικόν* at x. 39. 2 (with Kiessling and Jacoby). The context at ix. 53. 4 calls for *κράτος* (or *θάρσος*) rather than

κλέος and at x. 24. 5 perhaps *ἐπιέναι* rather than *ἐξίέναι* (despite x. 23. 3); at x. 47. 1 *ὁρθῶς* seems too bare by itself.

The translation is uniformly accurate and graceful.

A. H. McDONALD.

University of Sydney.

PSELLUS

Leendert Gerrit WESTERINK: Michael Psellus, *De omnifaria doctrina*. Critical text and introduction. Pp. 112. Nijmegen: Centrale Drukkerij, 1948. Paper, 17s. 6d.

MICHAEL PSELLUS is one of the most interesting and many-sided figures of the Middle Ages, orator, pamphleteer, philosopher, monk (though only temporarily and by force of circumstances), administrator, political wire-puller, and above all author of one of the raciest histories ever written. Who that has read his *Chronographia* can ever forget the matrimonial adventures of the elderly empress Zoe? And how Gibbon, had he known it, would have delighted to adorn his pages with extracts therefrom! But in the work before us Michael 'Stammers' (he admits in § 8 that, true to his family name, he had a bit of a stammer) is in a sober mood. As one who, as he somewhere tells us, at the age of 25 knew everything that there was to know, he was doubtless competent to compile this handbook of general information, which is not without interest nowadays, as showing what Byzantine personages in high places were expected to know. The sections dealing with physics were dedicated to Constantine IX Monomachus (1042-54), who is invited by the author to apply to him for further information about geometrical propositions which may be unfamiliar to an imperial ear (§§ 127, 143). Of this part of the treatise, called by Dr. Westerink Redaction I, 'the plan obviously was to deal with the subjects treated in Plutarch's *Placita*, from which however as a rule only the headings of the sections are taken'. The sources of nearly all the sections are known. Most of them are quoted almost verbatim. Where Psellus con-

flates or abridges he does so with the skill of a thoroughly competent man of letters, and the result is always smooth and readable. For physics, astronomy, and physiology, his source is mainly Plutarch, for meteorology Olympiodorus in *meteora Aristotelis* or Aristotle himself, for Platonic psychology and metaphysics Proclus.

Some years later Psellus compiled a similar series of theological extracts for his pupil Michael VII Ducas, who reigned from 1071 to 1078, though he had been co-emperor with his father for some years previously. These, with some forty further sections *περί νοῦ*, *περί ψυχῆς*, and *περί ἀρετῶν*, were added to the former work, the whole forming Westerink's Redaction II. Subsequently the contents of these redactions were rearranged and the order of the sections largely altered. Redactions III and IV give the final result, the main difference between the two being that IV omits the supplement, §§ 194-201, and has a different title *πρὸς . . . Μιχαὴλ τὸν Δοῦκαν αὐτοκράτορα γεγονότα*, which suggests that it was published in or after 1071. Westerink has consulted every available manuscript of the two oldest redactions and a selection of those of the two later. In his Introduction he gives a full account of these manuscripts with the order of their contents, and constructs an approximate pedigree of them, adding numerous references to other manuscripts where portions of Psellus' compendium appear. His 14 pages of Introduction are the fruits of very long and conscientious labour, for which he merits the highest praise. The text of the treatise is good and there are not many readings of special interest in the full *apparatus criticus*. In § 8, l. 7 *ὑποστατική δέ ἐστι διαφορά, ὅταν αἱ ὑπό*

τὴν μίαν οὐσίαν ὑποστάσεις διήρηνται ἀπ' ἀλλήλων εἰς ἀριθμὸν καὶ πλῆθος ὥσι (where no critical note is added) διήρηνται must be an error for διηρημέναι. In an appendix Westerink prints four short treatises of Psellus from Redaction III, three of which have never before been published, one on αἰών, and two of a theological nature.

Psellus was a pronounced Platonist and under Constantine Monomachus preached Platonism to large audiences. But Byzantine ecclesiastics by no means regarded the Platonic philosophy as the old loving nurse of the Church, and indeed in 1082 they secured the condemnation of Psellus' successor, Italus, for his Platonic heresies. Psellus therefore walks warily in this treatise, and

the orthodoxy of its theological sections is impeccable. In his epilogue, after remarking τὰ μὲν ἀπὸ τῶν ἡμετέρων ἱερῶν κρατήρων ἀρυσάμενος συναγέσχα, πολλά δὲ καὶ ἀπὸ τῶν ἀλμυρῶν ὑδάτων, φημι δὴ τῶν Ἑλληνικῶν, he says that he has done his best to purge the latter and to harmonize them with 'our own true doctrines', but has been unable altogether to remove their peculiarities. It is perhaps worth adding that no classical student will find difficulty in reading this eleventh-century Greek treatise, which indeed consists almost wholly of extracts from earlier writers. There were no literary Dark Ages in Byzantium. Psellus and his admirer, Anna Comnena, prove that.

J. H. SLEEMAN.

CICERO THE LAWYER

R. N. WILKIN: *Eternal Lawyer*. A Legal Biography of Cicero. Pp. xvi + 264. New York: The Macmillan Company (London: Macmillan), 1947. Cloth, 15s. net.

MOMMSEN'S more short-sighted criticisms of Cicero include the observations that he was 'by nature a journalist in the worst sense of that term' and 'he was nothing but an advocate, and not a good one'. Within the last few years two champions, a journalist and a lawyer, have come forth on the other side of the Atlantic to challenge and rebut Mommsen's verdict in books written for a wide public. H. J. Haskell, the editor of a great American newspaper, in a most lively work, *This was Cicero*, has used his practical experience of politics in action, gained as a Washington correspondent, to probe to the truth lying hidden below political speech and conduct, and now the opposite profile, a complementary portrait of Cicero the lawyer, has been drawn by Mr. Wilkin, a federal judge of the United States. That these men, representing two professions, should have turned aside to record their estimates of Cicero's personality and achievement helps to underline the permanent value of Cicero's influence in world history, and to counteract the portraits drawn, however brilliantly, by Mommsen and cer-

tain other more recent professional historians. Not that Cicero has lacked his admirers in America: indeed in the eighteenth century he was generally as highly esteemed there as in eighteenth-century England, and it was in connexion with the debate that preceded the framing of the American Constitution that John Adams wrote: 'As all ages of the world have not produced a greater statesman and philosopher united than Cicero, his authority should have great weight.'

This legal biography of Cicero offers a clue to the apparent inconsistency of many of his actions. Judge Wilkin's main thesis is that Cicero throughout his life remained true to his early legal training: love of the Republic and a profound belief in the eternal value of law ('one law, eternal and unchangeable, binding at all times upon all peoples') formed the mainsprings of his whole activity. Cicero made his mistakes, but 'at no time', writes Judge Wilkin (p. 240) 'was he faithless to his professional principles. He was devoted to the maintenance of law and order and justice. It is consistent with his principles that he did not resort to force or practice the arts of the demagogue.' When Cicero staked his future, and perhaps his life, on his determination to defend Roscius, his controlling motive was not

ambition, but 'the consciousness of the performance of his duty as a lawyer'. 'Stimulated by the thought of the dependence and gratitude of his client, strengthened by the thought that he was the defender of a just man, and fortified by his knowledge of the orderly processes of the law, he resolutely ascended the Rostra' (p. 13). So through the other major crises of his life. In the Catilinarian conspiracy it was 'his zeal to suppress lawlessness' that 'led him into temporary neglect or misinterpretation of a fundamental principle of Roman policy' (p. 239). Professor Hugh Last (*J.R.S.* xxxiii, 1943, 94 f.) has recently drawn attention to the fact that in Sallust's account (*Cat.* 50. 1-3) the reason why Cicero convened the Senate for 5 December was a threat to release the prisoners by force: he raises the issue whether this implies that the danger had reached a magnitude which could no longer be met by the procedure prescribed by the law, i.e. whether 'the legal procedure of accusation and trial could not be followed without graver risks to society than could reasonably be run by a magistrate responsible for its preservation'. Judge Wilkin refers to this possible justification of Cicero's conduct and on p. 91 he says that, following the rumour of forcible liberation, 'it was a serious situation', but later (p. 95) he is 'not convinced that the Republic could have been greatly endangered by requiring the conspirators to be sentenced in due course of judicial procedure': thus Cicero the lawyer was temporarily blinded by Cicero the consul.

Considerations of space do not allow us to follow or discuss the Judge's estimate of how far Cicero fell short of his ideals at other turning-points in his life, as the First Triumvirate, the Civil War, and the contest with Antony. He makes

no attempt to gloss over, but rather helps to explain, Cicero's more obvious faults, but he is more concerned with his vision than his warts: 'we see Cicero in true perspective only when we consider the permanence of the principles which he espoused'. He thus discusses with sympathy Cicero's philosophy of life, of government, and of law, wherein lay his real humanity and true greatness.

A few small points may be noted. Neither Terentia (p. 28) nor C. Antonius (p. 80) was a patrician. The Social and Marsian Wars might be more specifically identified (p. 6); the reason for Sulla's murder of Ofella might be explained (p. 12); surely it was Cato rather than Caesar (p. 106) that demanded the prosecution of Clodius, since Caesar even refused to give evidence; on p. 195 for 'provincial' (*bis*) read 'municipal'; Cato scarcely 'followed Pompey to Egypt' (p. 160), since news of Pompey's death turned him back. This last reference ('Cato . . . followed P. to Egypt and committed suicide') suggests that here and elsewhere the strategic and political background might, with advantage, have been drawn in more detail; e.g. on p. 156 the transition from events in Rome to Pharsalus is abrupt; more might be said on such topics as the political relations of the Senate and Equites or the activities of Crassus. In view of the fact that one of the main methods of gaining political power was through legal practice and *amicitia* displayed in the law courts, it must remain an open question whether the politician or the lawyer was the stronger in Cicero, but Judge Wilkin has drawn a sympathetic portrait of one whose *humanitas* and reverence for law have had a profound effect on later generations and still have a lesson to teach the world of to-day.

H. H. SCULLARD.

King's College, London.

THE ROMAN REPUBLIC

F. R. COWELL: *Cicero and the Roman Republic*. Pp. xiii + 306; 32 plates, 16 charts. London: Pitman, 1948. Cloth, 20s. net.

THIS is the first volume to be published of a series entitled 'The Measure of the

Ages', each of which is to 'be a human story written in the light of the background, experience and achievements of a well-known historical figure . . . special attention will also be paid to the statistical, quantitative aspect of historical

change, which will be illuminated by means of pictorial charts designed by the Isotype Institute'.

The title of this volume is slightly misleading, since the book covers a wide field: if the words are to be used, *The Roman Republic and Cicero* might perhaps give a better impression of the content, since only about half deals strictly with Cicero and his times. It is, however, a pleasant book to read and handle, with over thirty illustrations in photogravure. Two chapters on Roman expansion to 200 B.C. are followed by two more on the Roman farmer and Roman industry, and by six on the constitution and its working. Then come three on political development from Marius to Caesar, and chapters on aspects of life in Cicero's day: republicanism, the aristocracy, cultural life, the common people, with a final interesting diagnosis of 'The sickness of Roman social life'. The author shows a refreshing desire to get under the skin of the Romans, or at any rate to try to see things as they really were in daily life: as he says, 'we want to be able to imagine the Roman busy at his farm, in politics, trade, industry' (p. 211). At the same time he obviously writes with a strong feeling of the development and pressure of events in recent years and thus gives a greater sense of realism to his handling of the problems of the ancient world.

Since this book is obviously designed to interest a wide public, the question arises whether the author has not tried to pack in a little too much. In seeking his material he rushes rather frequently up and down the corridors of time, and this might prove confusing to readers who are not very familiar with the layout of the whole building. Need so much have been said about, for instance, the struggle of the patricians and plebeians in a book dealing mainly with the later Republic, and might not some of the earlier material have been handled more concisely and perhaps more chronologically?

A special feature of the book is the

sixteen coloured 'Isotype' charts which are very pleasant to look at and stimulate reflection. While a few of them are of doubtful relevance (was it worth including two on the composition and battle-order of the army in the Heroic Age?), some convey much information in a form designed to help the reader to grasp it quickly and perhaps remember it easily. It is unfortunate that there does not survive more statistical information about the Roman world which would render more fruitful an approach such as that made by means of these diagrams and charts.

It is scarcely necessary to record the list of slips which one reader has noted (e.g. Adherbal and Hiempsal were sons of Micipsa, not of Masinissa, p. 166), but in a work which emphasizes the statistical and visual it may be remarked that the estimated figures given (p. 123) for the classes of the *Comitia Centuriata* are impossible (there may have been 84,000 voters in classes II-V combined, but not that number in each class); the 'Janus *as*' depicted on pl. 20(a) is in fact a 'Jupiter' *semitis*, and the aureus (*m*) is not 'natural size' (on early coinage the author in the main accepts H. Mattingly's views, but reverts to the pre-Mattingly era on p. 86 when he refers to a 2 oz. *as* in 269 B.C.). But slips of this sort are not going to do a great deal of harm. More important than such matters is the fact that the author has written a stimulating and lively sketch of the world of the Roman Republic, giving his own judgement on its achievements and failures, and emphasizing the permanent value of Cicero's contribution: 'Cicero has the enduring honour of having been one of the very early champions of social harmony and of the rule of law (p. 291) . . . despite his inadequacy he was on the side of the angels, for in comparison with his contemporaries, Julius Caesar included, he stood out as a great advocate of the eternal values of the human spirit' (p. 288).

H. H. SCULLARD.

King's College, London.

CUPID AND PSYCHE

Ettore PARATORE: *Apulei Metamorphoseon Libri IV-VI* (la Favola di Amore e Psiche). Introduzione e testo critico. (Biblioteca di Studi Superiori, Filologia Latina, I.) Pp. 157. Florence: 'La Nuova Italia', 1948. Paper.

As a critical edition this painstaking book (which, like Jahn-Michaelis, includes only the actual Psyche story, iv. 28-vi. 24) is ruined by faults of method. In several passages of his Introduction (e.g. p. 7) Paratore accepts the view that all our manuscripts are derived from F, yet he cannot resist treating both ϕ and A as witnesses of independent value, even where F's text is not in doubt. He regards A's readings, for example, in v. 22 and viii. 9 as decisive, against F's, on points of orthography, and he uses the phrase 'la non unanimità della tradizione manoscritta' (p. 71) to describe the fact that, in vi. 12, A has a *te* not present in F. He actually writes (p. 16) that, though its many bad readings suffice to put A into a position of subjection (*sudditanza*) in respect of F and of inferiority in respect of ϕ , 'non autorizza d'altro canto a supporre che le rette lezioni da esso fornitici siano soltanto congetture felici di emendatori'. He makes no attempt to give this untenable suggestion a logical basis.

If this attitude causes less harm than might have been feared, this is because Paratore shows knowledge only of those readings of A which were quoted by Giarratano, who understood the limits of their relevance. Paratore's own apparatus is in fact essentially Giarratano's, a little refurbished in the light of my Budé text and of the third edition of Helm. Giarratano practically confined himself to F, ϕ , and A, and Paratore wholly ignores the other important manuscripts of Class I, U, E, and S, which I use in my apparatus, though he lists the worthless Laudianus and Dorvillianus. This, again, does less harm than might be expected, since A is on the whole the best witness of its class, but it has the absurd result that in v. 13, for instance, he quotes A's corrupt, though significant, *dictareque*, but de-

scribes the true *dicatque* given by U, E, and S as *deteriorum codicum lectionem*.

Paratore speaks courteously of my work, but I must reluctantly point out that he repeatedly misrepresents me, not only in small points, for instance about a note of mine on vii. 12 (p. 54), but also on wider issues. He writes (p. 28) that 'il Robertson... ha registrato con soverchia minuzia le più insignificanti variazioni grafiche dei codici poziori', and yet 'nonostante la sua minuziosità, cade in frequenti e strane omissioni, trascurando di registrare varianti grafiche di F rispetto alla restante migliore tradizione, anche quando tali varianti incidono sul senso'. As for the first point, I do not in fact record orthographical variations for their own sakes, except in the case of F, about which we cannot know too much: as for the second, this cannot mean that I omit any of F's own variants, which is palpably false, but that I do not call attention to divergent readings in other manuscripts, unless they seem to me either to throw light on F's text or to have intrinsic value as emendations. If I do not respect the 'restante migliore tradizione', that is because it does not exist.

Paratore is very confident that he can put other scholars right, and misrepresents many besides me, for example, in the fantastic view attributed to Helm in his note on vi. 7 (p. 140), but I will confine myself to two cases out of many where I am the victim. On p. 36 he goes out of his way to accuse me of *arbitrariamente* giving to what he calls the '*Cronica*' of Malespini the title ('*Ist. Flor.*') under which the work which I cite was in fact published by Muratori; and on p. 90 he states that in vi. 19 I attribute to Brakman the merit of Walter's *rimari curiosius* in vi. 19. I do so because Brakman (*Miscella Tertia*, 1917, p. 10) anticipated Walter (*Phil. Woch.* 1934, col. 1327) by seventeen years.

I have spent long enough on destructive comment, but Paratore has set back the clock of Apuleian criticism, and this fact must be proclaimed. The best section of the book, though it could with advantage have been shortened, is the

latter part of the Introduction (pp. 18-92), especially the first dozen pages, which deal with such points of orthography as the vexed problem of *flagrare* and *fraglare*. He makes good use of the Oldfather *Index*, for instance on *e re* and *e re nata* (p. 53), though there are some odd omissions, as on p. 32 n. 1, where he should have noted i. 19, *trepidus et . . . metuens*, and similar combinations in iv. 18 and viii. 19, which cut across one of his generalizations.

From p. 29 onwards he deals very diffusely with a series of individual passages. What he writes usually deserves attention: two of the best bits are in defence of *obsequia* in v. 13 and of *dominum* in v. 23. He seems wide of the mark, however, in championing *demens* . . . *sonus* in v. 4, in the sense (which his citation of Sil. ii. 309 does nothing to support) of 'un suono senza corpo,

senza individualità'. His logic is sometimes hard to follow: how, for instance, (p. 79) does F's habitual spelling *suppmi* decisively prove that *pmi* in vi. 15 cannot be a corruption of *supremi*?

The Introduction ends with a table of some seventy parallel passages from the editions of Helm, Giarratano, myself, and Paratore, in which he differs from us all. When so tabulated, most of his alternatives strike me as at least defensible, and several are marked in my apparatus as possibly preferable to my text.

The book is on the whole well printed, but how did a critical note on *prospicua* in vi. 20 find its way into the apparatus of v. 20? Truly in textual corruption nothing is impossible.

D. S. ROBERTSON.

Trinity College, Cambridge.

GRUNDY'S THUCYDIDES

G. B. GRUNDY: *Thucydides and the History of his Age*. Volume I (second edition): pp. xix+553. Volume II: pp. xv+256; 7 maps, 24 plates. Oxford: Blackwell, 1948. Cloth, 25s. net each.

DR. GRUNDY'S *Thucydides* has long been out of print, and copies have been difficult to obtain. The reprinting of it was well worth while, for much of it is of value, the chapter on the food-supply of Greece, for example, those on the art of war, and, perhaps more than anything, the appendix on the composition of Thucydides' *History*: this is, of its kind, the most lucid, and therefore the most useful, exposition of the problem that I know, even though it is far from being conclusive, and is somewhat mechanical in argument, ignoring as it does such important things as the consistency both in style and in political thought which is so notable throughout Thucydides' work. All this is worth reading and thinking about again; it is interesting also to recall the curious twists of Dr. Grundy's mind, such as the characteristic sentence in the preface: 'I am convinced that . . . in the life of peoples it is the material rather than the intellectual interest which makes contem-

porary history. Voltaire and Rousseau would have talked to deaf ears, had they talked to men contented with their lot.' Were V. and R. read by the starving? And, by implication even in this sentence, Grundy admits the greater importance of the intellectual interest, as he clearly states in the preface to his new volume, 'the longer I have studied Thucydides the more convinced have I become that in judging of the work of any historian it is necessary to take into consideration two things—his individual nature and, secondly, the intellectual interests which were active in the age and the society to which he belonged'.

He has left his earlier volume practically unrevised—with that one can sympathize, though he might have made it more useful to modern readers by correcting some misprints, altering out-of-date references (e.g. to *C.I.A.*, and even two by Bekker's method of reference in Thucydides), and by mentioning at least a few things that have been done since 1911, such as the publication of papyri and Finley's studies on Thucydides' style for c. ii, the work of Kromayer for the military chapters, and that of Fabricius, Hammond, and many others in topography.

This last I looked for again in the topographical chapter of the new volume; but in vain. Everything in it might also have been written thirty-five years ago; and, except for a few excellent photographs of Pylos and Sphacteria, hardly anything is added to Grundy's own published topographical studies; for Pylos and Plataea were the only places on which he had much to tell us. And he can say, in an Introduction dated 1947, 'in schools of history like Oxford, history is apt to be stereotyped into a creed. Grote is the Athanasius of Greek History in England.' Other chapters in the new volume do not in the least depend upon modernity, as that on 'The Spirit of an Age', and Thucydides' 'Philosophy of History'; but it will suffice if I quote one or two sentences to show their quality: 'there are certain significant facts about the tyranny of the Thirty, the significance of which throws some light on the position of humanism in the intellectual world of the time. Socrates (Xen. *Hell.* i. 7. 15) appears to have accepted a post of some importance among those who supported the movement for reform'; 'Plato's method of procedure (in the *Republic*) was somewhat fantastic, too fantastic even for the Greek; and Plato's ideas, which included a large communistic element, and were made out of fragments of constitutions of numerous Greek states, made no impression on the Greek political mind.' Most significant of all for the author's sense both of method and of achievement is this, introductory to a section on the philosophic element in Thucydides: the *History* 'is not an ordered treatise, but a mass of material scattered, it might almost be said at random, through his work. Thus the collection of it is a somewhat laborious business, a labour

which may be taken once and for all by one man and need not be repeated again and again by those who are interested in the study of the subject.' This is followed by some seventy extracts, mostly short sentences taken from the speeches (the context does not matter), with *observatiunculae* attached: which take some such form as, "'For the times and tides of war wait for no man" (i. 142). Cf. Rundstedt's recent attack (Dec. 1944) on the allies in the Ardennes.'

There are many misprints, especially false references, and a number of careless mistranslations of Thucydides.

The last two chapters are on 'Parties at Athens' and 'Sparta in the Fifth Century'. In the first we read of 'the moderate democratic or Middle Party, which was almost wholly rural in its composition, and comprised most of the men of the hoplite census. . . . They were quite ready to accept Spartan help in the establishment of a moderate, in place of an extreme, democracy'—like, one must suppose, the Acharnians of Thucydides and Aristophanes. But the interesting thing about this analysis of the parties (the aristocrats being ready to accept Spartan domination, and the extreme democrats eager for war and empire) is that in this book, which is about Thucydides, the author is not interested in Thucydides' own silence in the matter. The chapter on Sparta is much the best in the book; it is a genuine expansion of what Dr. Grundy had to say in the first volume, it contains a plausible thesis, and it does attempt to account for Thucydides' own attitude to the problem. But that is not much for which to ask twenty-five shillings.

A. W. GOMME.

University of Glasgow.

CLASSICAL CRETE

Henri VAN EFFENTERRE: *La Crète et le Monde grec de Platon à Polybe*. (Bibliothèque des Écoles Françaises d'Athènes et de Rome, fasc. 163.) Pp. 340; 3 plates. Paris: de Boccard, 1948. Paper.

CLASSICAL Crete was unfortunate in its

historians, whether these are, like Plato, captivated by its Minoan past and ancient Dorian institutions or, like Polybius, obsessed with the seamy side of Cretan mercenary activity. M. van Effenterre endeavours to steer between these extremes, but his partiality for the

modern Cretans, so like in many respects to their ancestors, leads him sometimes into, not advocacy, but an engaging readiness to give his clients the benefit of the doubt.

He observes that only specialists are interested in classical or Hellenistic Crete. The reviewer is not a specialist and will give no detailed criticism of his work, which rests, more surely than on the scattered and tendentious literary sources, on the inscriptions of Crete. Through the multiplicity of specialist detail he presents a clear picture of historical development, which gives the book a wider interest. He finds the guiding thread in the principle that Crete is still the island of a hundred cities, and what is true of one is not true of another; when our sources speak of Crete they commonly refer to Knossos or Gortyn; when they speak of dissension and civil war they often mean war between independent states. The history of Hellenistic Crete is that of continued attempts to find a balance between so many independent cities, in accordance with the current ideas of federalism and large powers. Two systems were proposed: one unitary, favoured by Knossos, one federal, followed by Gortyn. Round these two cities the others were grouped in changing alliances, in which there was, however, a fair measure of stability. The external policies of the Cretan cities, so baffling if treated simply in terms of piracy and mercenary soldiering, are explained on the principle that the most prominent group of cities seeks the alliance of the dominant naval power in the Aegean, while their rivals take to piracy in support of the powers of disorder. External relations are illuminated by the records of Cretan mercenaries, whose activities are by no means disorderly; they did not individually engage their swords (or rather, bows) to the highest bidder, but were contingents sent by Cretan cities in support of their allies and paid by the latter, and their recruitment was regulated by treaty.

Together with the federal tendency, which found its form in the loose confederation of the Koinon, goes the pro-

gress of democracy. Knossos is the protagonist of democracy and domination over her allies, Gortyn of a more equal union of oligarchies.

Before coming to the chronological limits indicated by his title, M. van Effenterre has a chapter on Crete and Greece in the fifth century. A discussion of the geographical position of Crete, which was the necessary condition of the sea-power of Minos and has assured strategic importance to the island in Venetian times and in our own day, refutes the theory of the 'discovery' of Crete in the fourth century, expressed so seductively by Wilamowitz. Its position on the sea-ways from east to west and from the Aegean to Cyrene and Egypt ensured constant intercourse to the port-towns, at least; strategic significance is shown during the Peloponnesian War. None the less, 'la Crète n'est qu'une marche de l'hellénisme et mène une vie provinciale sans histoire'. This was changed by the Macedonian conquest of Egypt; at the same epoch, the old social order was overthrown under pressure of increasing wealth and class-conflict. The latter construction, though logical, is perhaps more clear-cut than the evidence will stand. As M. van Effenterre points out, there are very few fourth-century inscriptions, and the coinage, copious earlier, is poor for most of the century. This fact may suggest that the picture of growing commercial wealth at this period is at fault, or applies not to the whole of Crete but to one or two cities.

For the Platonist, there is a chapter on the *Laws*, which finds traces of local colour in the setting of the dialogue—who that has stood at Phaistos and looked up at Mt. Ida, seen at the end of an avenue of cypresses, will deny that the description of the road from Knossos to the cave of Zeus, though lightly drawn, is true to the spirit of Cretan landscape?—outlines a comparison of the institutions of the ideal city with those of Gortyn, as well as Athens and Sparta, and suggests that Plato had paid a visit, though perhaps a fleeting one, to Crete.

Finally, M. van Effenterre discusses

'the reputation of the Cretans' and Polybius' unfavourable judgement on them. He has little difficulty in showing that Polybius' antipathy is due to the fact that Knossos, now replacing Gortyn as leader of the Koinon, belonged to the system of alliances opposed to Achaea in Polybius' day. Most of the later authors who revile the warlike Cretans follow Polybius; and it is fair to note that now many who have never heard of Polybius derive their knowledge of the ancient Cretans from St. Paul's quotation of a verse of Epimenides, himself a Cretan to whom self-criticism may be permitted.

M. van Effenterre is an archaeologist; but excavation has as yet afforded little

material for the history of this period, apart from inscriptions (it is odd not to find Pendlebury's name in the list of modern authors which forms part of the admirable index). The Attic red-figure vases of the fourth century from sites in west Crete, in the museums of Canea and Rethymnos, indicate that more evidence lies under the ground. But less is known, materially, of classical than of Roman Crete. The excavation of Greek Knossos has not so far been very productive, except of early tombs, but may yet throw more light on the history of Crete.

T. J. DUNBABIN.

All Souls College, Oxford.

THE LATE ROMAN EMPIRE

F. W. WALBANK: *The Decline of the Roman Empire in the West*. Pp. xiii + 97; 13 plates, map. London: Cobbett Press, 1946. Cloth, 7s. 6d. net.

THIS book, the third volume in the series 'Past and Present', contains the most serious attempt made in recent years to explain the collapse of the Western Roman Empire. It is true that Professor Walbank avoids the complementary and, indeed, inseparable problem of why the Eastern Empire survived. It is true that his use of modern terms such as 'Corporative State' (p. 46 f.) is somewhat misleading (though see now his remarks in *J.H.S.* lxiv, 1944, p. 13, n. 10), and some will doubt the view that 'in its own time and context the Corporative State represented the only possible means of preserving the classical heritage, and was indeed "the last hope of all friends of civilisation"' (p. 76). It is also true that the class divisions of the later Empire are not consistently borne in mind: thus, 'The characteristic constituent of the world they [i.e. the later Emperors] shaped was compulsion. It had to be a world in which every action of every individual was regulated' (p. 49). Sextus Petronius Probus would have smiled at this. Nevertheless, we repeat that the reader will find no better exposition of the reasons why the Western Empire declined.

The book is so short that it would be unfair to summarize its argument. Here are a few *marginalia*.

p. 1. For a fourth-century attempt to explain the decline of Roman power in purely economic and social terms with due allowance for the role played by the individual see the *Anonymi de rebus bellicis liber* published by Gelenius at Basle in 1552 and again by S. Reinach, *Revue archéologique* (1922), pp. 205 ff.

pp. 22 ff. If the institution of slavery inhibited technical progress in Greek and Roman society, what of the northern barbarians? Their societies were not based on slavery to the same extent as that of the Greco-Roman world, and it is no coincidence that the major inventions and discoveries of the period of Roman greatness were not made by Romans at all, but by barbarians. The technical debt of the Roman world to the barbarians has recently been discussed by Lynn White, *Speculum*, xv, 1940, p. 144 (with extensive bibliography). White's list includes, not only such valuable technical accomplishments as the wearing of trousers and fur coats, but also 'cloisonné jewellery, felt-making, the ski, the use of soap for cleansing and of butter in place of olive oil, the making of barrels and tubs, the cultivation of rye, oats, spelt, and hops', to say nothing of the heavy plough, the stirrup, the horse-shoe, and the sport

of falconry (which was almost certainly popularized in Europe—in so far as falconry ever became popular—by the Huns). White's comments on this list deserve careful consideration. We may add that passages are not lacking in which Roman authors comment on the inventiveness of the barbarians. Thus, the Anonymus, mentioned above, writes in the preface to his work: 'cum barbarae nationes neque facundia polleant aut dignitatibus illustrentur, minime tamen a rerum inventione, natura opitulante, habentur alienae'. Again, Procopius, *B.G.* viii. 11. 27 ff., tells how, during the siege of Petra in Lazica, some Sabirian Huns showed the Romans how to make a new kind of battering ram. The passage is well worth quoting: *μηχανὴν τινα ἐπετεχνήσαντο, οἷα οὔτε Ῥωμαίων οὔτε Περσῶν τινί, ἐξ οὗ γεγόνασιν ἄνθρωποι, ἐς ἔννοιαν ἦλθε· καίτοι τεχνιτῶν μὲν πολλὸς ὄμιλος ἐν ἑκατέρᾳ πολιτείᾳ γέγονε τε αἰεὶ καὶ τανῦν ἔστιν. ἐς χρεῖαν δὲ πολλάκις ἐς τὸν πάντα αἰῶνα κατέστησαν τῆς μηχανῆς ἑκάτεροι ταύτης, ἐς ἐρύματα τειχομαχοῦντες ἐν χωρίοις σκληροῖς καὶ δυσβάτοις τισὶ κείμενα· ἀλλ' αὐτῶν οὐδενὶ τὸ ἐνθύμημα τοῦτο γεγένηται ὅπερ τούτοις δὴ τοῖς βαρβάροις τανῦν γέγονεν· οὕτως αἰεὶ προϊόντι τῷ χρόνῳ συννεωτερίζειν τῶν πραγμάτων τὰς ἐπινοίας φιλεῖ τῶν ἀνθρώπων ἡ φύσις.*

p. 28. The 'tendency of industry to export itself instead of its products' was increased by the later Emperors'

practice of exporting skilled technicians to foreign and even hostile countries: see the interesting collection of passages in Rudolf Helm, *Archiv für Urkundenforschung*, xii, 1932, p. 397, n. 1. But this export was sometimes involuntary. There is an illuminating passage in Herodian (iii. 4. 8 f.), where we are told that after the defeat of Pescennius Niger many of his supporters fled to Persia and revolutionized Persian military technique. Herodian ends the passage thus: *τῶν δὲ φυγάδων στρατιωτῶν, πολλῶν τε ἐν αὐτοῖς τεχνιτῶν, παρ' αὐτοῖς γενομένων καὶ τὸν ἐκεῖ βίον ἐλομένων, οὐ μόνον χρῆσθαι ἀλλὰ καὶ ἐργάζεσθαι ὅπλα ἐδιδάχθησαν.*

p. 56. We cannot but regret that W. repeats the judgement of Professor Toynbee on East Roman civilization. Those who wish for an introduction to the ever-changing and developing fabric of East Roman society cannot do better than read P. Charanis, 'On the Social Structure of the Later Roman Empire', *Byzantiom*, xvii, 1944-5, pp. 39-57.

This book is one of the most stimulating works that has appeared on late Roman history in recent years. It is nicely produced and excellently illustrated, and is equipped with a bibliographical note and an index. Professor Walbank and the editor of this valuable series are to be warmly congratulated.

E. A. THOMPSON.

University of Nottingham.

ATTILA

E. A. THOMPSON: *A History of Attila and the Huns*. Pp. xii + 228. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1948. Cloth, 15s. net.

THE Huns are likely always to remain one of the mysteries of history. Since they produced no material objects, or at any rate none that can be identified as theirs, archaeology cannot help, and they had no native literature. Our only sources are the Greek and Latin authors, and they too often in default of genuine information serve us up with clichés from Herodotus, while the two most important, Olympiodorus and Priscus, survive only in scattered fragments.

Professor Thompson has made a masterly use of his meagre material to

produce an interesting and, so far as the paucity of the evidence allows, authoritative account of the Huns during the only period in which their history can be traced, from the 70s of the fourth century, when they overran the Ostrogothic kingdom, to the 60s of the fifth, when their empire finally disintegrated. He traces the military and diplomatic relations of the Huns with the western and eastern halves of the Empire, including the extraordinary embassy of 449 on which Priscus himself served and which he has described in such vivid detail. The two most valuable chapters are those in which he analyses Hunnic society before and

under Attila. In them he goes far to explain why the Hunnic empire rose and fell with such extraordinary suddenness. In their normal nomadic condition the Huns were of economic necessity divided into numerous small tribes, which the Roman government could and did play off one against another, taking some into its service to fight its German foes. Only when united under a supreme war-lord were the Huns a menace to the Empire, but it was only by continually extracting tribute and blackmail that a war-lord could hold the loyalty of his subordinate chiefs and even feed his host. Such a delicate equilibrium was highly precarious.

In another chapter Professor Thompson discusses the policy of the Roman government towards the Huns, vindicating Theodosius II's (or rather Chrysaphius') system of appeasement and subsidies, and condemning Marcian's defiance, which, as he justly points out, might have been disastrous for the Empire but for the lucky accident of Attila's death. He is probably right in arguing that the subsidies were far less expensive than the large-scale military operations which would have been neces-

sary, and that if even they had been successful, such operations would have entailed terrible devastation of the Empire. Priscus, he suggests, condemned the policy of subsidies not because it was ignominious—it was regularly employed by the Roman Empire—but because Chrysaphius raised the gold required by levies on the senatorial order. And these, he argues, were well within their capacity to pay: to the figures which he quotes may be added another from Iohannes Lydus (*Mag.* iii. 48), who tells how Anastasius, learning that a senator was financially embarrassed, paid off his debts to the tune of 1,000 lb. gold and gave him another 1,000 lb. gold to put him on his feet again. So far Professor Thompson is convincing, but when he adopts the highly questionable theory that the Greens and Blues represented rival economic interests, the merchants and the landowners, and argues that Chrysaphius was consciously promoting the interests of the former, who profited from peaceful commercial intercourse with the Huns, he is on much less firm ground.

A. H. M. JONES.

University College, London.

GREEK AND ENGLISH

J. A. K. THOMSON: *The Classical Background of English Literature*. Pp. 272. London: Allen & Unwin, 1948. Cloth, 12s. 6d. net.

DEFENDERS of the Classics can use two types of argument. They can urge how much the Ancients still give that the Moderns still want—or are wanting in. Or they can urge how much the Ancients have already given to influence modern literature and ideas. The drawback to dwelling too much on this past influence is that most men are less concerned with the past than with the present and the future. Vast our debt may be; but in many minds our debt to Greece and Rome, like our debt to America, wakes gratitude perhaps, but moderate enthusiasm. Again, the study of influences, so beloved by scholars, often leads out into a barren and depressing wilderness. There is a dangerous temptation to start inventing influences when

enough cannot be discovered; and to forget that, after all, what an author borrows often signifies little, except to our rather frivolous curiosity. The vital things about him are not what he stole, but what he produced; not his likeness to other writers, but his unlikeness—his uniqueness in the world.

But while it remains much more essential to stress what the Ancients still are and still can be than what they have been, both lines of defence are clearly needed. And the dangers of the study of influences are skilfully avoided by Professor Thomson's useful and sensible book. He aims primarily at telling non-classical students of English literature what English literature has owed to Greek and Latin; half of his book is devoted to an excellent summary of the relevant classical authors themselves; and the remaining five chapters deal with the Middle Ages, the Renaissance,

and the last three centuries, including our own. In so compressed a survey it would not be easy to say much that is new: Professor Thomson has wisely set out, first of all, to be fair and true. But he not only succeeds in this; he also makes, in passing, some points that will be new to many, and were well worth making. He notes, for example, how Shakespeare in *Julius Caesar*, without Plutarch's help, somehow succeeded in composing for Brutus in the Forum an imitation of the dry Attic style that is strikingly like the real thing. Again, he provides an excellent example of how little tradition cramps real originality, in a contrast drawn between Milton and Dryden: Milton, so classic in his technique, seems to-day far more original than Dryden, who in his own time was far more modern in experiment and innovation. And, among Dryden's innovations, Professor Thomson well points out how wise it was of him to drop the rough diction and metre of his predecessors in satire, and replace their knotted bludgeons with that smooth and steely style which he bequeathed to be still further smoothed and sharpened by Pope. Finally, Professor Thomson makes some sane remarks on translation, which are not unneeded now that many translators have removed their English style from despised Wardour Street to Cheapside, or still farther east; pointing out that to render Homer's simple magnificence into modern journalese is no more intelligent than it would be to render into similar modern French prose the richness of *Antony and Cleopatra* or *Paradise Lost*.

It is of course possible to criticize certain details. Some readers will hear with surprise that the 'typical' Greek tragedy has 'five' episodes; that it has 'never any admixture of comedy', while 'every character speaks in a diction as majestic and remote from ordinary conversation as that of *Paradise Lost*' (but Euripides?); that Theocritus lived 'between the third and fourth centuries B.C.' (surely the briefest poet's life on record!—and, after all, his whole working life was in the third); that for

the Greeks the sea was 'just the violet-coloured sea' (when one thinks of all the superb descriptions from Homer to the *Anthology*!); that 'it was the Greeks who had something to say, not the Romans' (but Catullus? Lucretius? Horace? Tacitus?); that Gray chose 'to follow Dryden rather than Pindar himself in the construction of his odes' (yet Gray uses strophe, antistrophe, and epode); that Blake 'does not attack' the classical tradition; and that to prefer the *Odyssey* to the *Iliad*, as the nineteenth century tended to do, 'is a great mistake' (can one dogmatize?—may not one seem finer in parts, the other as a constructed whole?).

But these are incidental matters, many of them debatable. There is a more important—and more debatable—criticism that some readers may be tempted to make of the general attitude of the book towards Greek literature. Like much past scholarship it tends at times to talk as if Athens were Greece—or at least the eye of Greece. If one takes the view stated at the beginning of this article that it is important to persuade the modern world of the still modern *interest* of Greek literature, it may be wiser not to be, like Brutus in the Forum, *too* Attic. Some of us, if asked to choose an ancient Greek city to live in, would hesitate about choosing Athens. How many of the Greek writers—poets especially—who are most alive to-day, were *not* Athenian!—Homer, Hesiod, the lyric and elegiac poets, Pindar, Herodotus, Simonides, Theocritus, Plutarch, the writers of the *Anthology*. Drama apart, Athens seems to have been a curiously unpoetic city. The Attic dramatists *are* great; but, for many, with another order of greatness than Homer's. The twentieth century hates platitudes and long-winded lamentations—and Greek tragedy is too prone to both. The twentieth century dislikes and distrusts rhetoric—and there is something too much of it in the tragedians, the orators, and even Thucydides. The twentieth century—so much of it as remains civilized—loathes totalitarianism; and the father of totalitarianism remains that gifted, but diseased

and dishonest writer, Plato. Athens will always keep her due place, while the Acropolis stands, and after. There is no need to exaggerate it—to be more Attic than the Athenians. Much of the best of Hellas lived in smaller, less domineering states, which possibly gained because their stock was less 'pure', less Mediterranean. It is perhaps well not to forget that drunken Helot who at some conference, years ago, objected to schoolboys' reading

Herodotus, lest it corrupt their Attic style!

But whether or no Professor Thomson thinks too much of Athens as compared with the rest of Greece (and he has the majority on his side), he has produced a very readable and reasonable contribution to the study of Greek literature by English students.

F. L. LUCAS.

King's College, Cambridge.

YALE CLASSICAL STUDIES, X

Yale Classical Studies. Edited by A. R. BELLINGER. Volume X. Pp. 281; 5 plates. New Haven: Yale University Press (London: Oxford University Press), 1947. Cloth, 22s. net.

AN article by C. E. Lutz on 'Musonius Rufus "The Roman Socrates"' occupies about half of this volume. A short introduction on Musonius' life and influence leads up to a reprint of Hense's text (with a few small deviations and the addition in XV of some ten lines from *The Rendel Harris Papyri I*) of the discourses and fragments, faced by an English translation and furnished with brief but useful notes. Musonius must have been a man of courage and conviction; his protest against the gladiatorial shows at Athens is a proof of his humanity. But the records of his teachings give little or no evidence of his distinctive personality. He helped to popularize some striking phrases (as that a king should be 'living law'), he disapproved of the exposure of children, his gods have an un-Stoic kindness and some degree of personality. But he had a habit of blunting the edge of most of his statements by reservations and even contradictions. Women should study philosophy; but 'philosophy' includes the details of good housekeeping. 'People cease from wrongdoing when they have been taught'; but 'practice is more effective than theory for the acquisition of virtue'. He dealt mostly in resounding platitudes, in easy deductions from the familiar Stoic tenets, in Cynic prejudices against eating meat, wearing a shirt, and shaving or even trimming one's beard. The translator warns us

against taking the records at their face value, but there is no evidence for her view that M. taught metaphysics; and her remark that XII contains an insistence on 'the essential human rights of slaves' is an overstatement. But in spite of his formalistic logic one may well agree that his teachings represent 'the greatest height Stoicism ever reached'. The translation, the first, I think, in English, is a meritorious performance. I have noted some small blemishes; examples are: p. 45, the omission of *περὶ αὐτόν* (= τὸν οἶκον) obscures the point about Eriphyle; p. 83, *τοῖς φιλοσοφῆσουσι* is rendered 'those who teach', instead of 'those who are to learn, philosophy'; p. 131, conditional sentences are mishandled, and the point of XXVII is lost by translating *συμφέροντος* as 'right'.

J. P. Maguire contributes a useful study of 'Plato's Theory of Natural Law'. The validity of law, written or unwritten, is independent of legislator or society; its source is 'nature' in one or other of its many senses, human, physical, divine. M. holds that 'despite verbal deviations and differences of view-point' Plato's attitude towards this concept remains throughout 'fundamentally the same'. Genuine law is the work of conscious design (*τέχνη*) which involves knowledge of the ideal-real world; the function of the legislator as of every other artist is thus to 'imitate' the Forms (though positivistic interpreters have tried to deny that Plato envisaged such 'imitation'). Soul, Mind, God, Forms, these are names for different aspects of the Reality which is to be

'imitated'; many differences of terminology are due to the fact that all varieties of 'nature', visible or invisible, provide clues to the understanding of the model. Since human nature belongs to the system of the universe and mirrors it, natural law is not only 'a dictate of right reason' but a *κοινὸν δόγμα*, a common conviction, or, in Stoic language, a 'propositio naturaliter cognita'. M. has done a good service in emphasizing a neglected aspect of Plato's political thought. His article is close-packed and summary. His thesis seems to me sound, though one may disagree on some details. But one might have expected a mention—if only to illustrate how the physical and moral orders intertwine to do justice—of the auto-

matic sanctions of virtue and vice. Some discussion of the Platonic doctrine of moral freedom would also seem to be necessary for completeness.

The final study—'The Archives of the Temple of Soknobraisis at Bacchias', by E. H. Gilliam—comprises the text and translation, with commentary, of twenty-five papyri, thirteen of which are in Yale and are now published for the first time. They reveal much about the economic position of a small Egyptian temple in the second and early third centuries A.D., and the strictness of Roman policy in dealing with temples and their priests.

J. TATE.

University of Sheffield.

SHORT REVIEWS

E. T. OWEN: *The Story of the Iliad as told in the Iliad*. Pp. xii+248. London: Bell, 1947. Cloth, 10s. 6d. net.

THE Professor of Greek in University College, Toronto, here expands for a wider audience his course of lectures to Toronto students on the *Iliad* as a work of literary art. In the preface he says that the work is addressed to students, that his aim 'is limited to illustrating by an object lesson how to study the poem as a poem', and that his method is 'to make a running commentary on the poem, going through it in order, book by book, picking up the contribution of each part or incident to the emotional effect of the whole'. He admits that this is a tall order—to unravel the inner secrets of great artistry is doubtless too delicate a task for anyone's fingers—but no one will quarrel with Professor Owen's conviction that the student must not only delight in the effect of a work of art but try to discover the methods by which the effect is produced.

Professor Owen has performed his task in a modest, sober, and workmanlike fashion. Any student who has just read the *Iliad* as a whole for the first time will profit by reading this book. It will help him to gain some idea of the size, shape, and majesty of the wood, in passing through which he will have collided with so many separate trees. He will also obtain from the footnotes and bibliography some helpful indications for further reading; but the bibliography might well have been fuller (it is restricted to works in English and omits some of the most significant of these, e.g. Bowra's *Tradition and Design*), and Professor Owen could have made his analysis of the *Iliad* deeper and more illuminating by incorporating the main results of recent work in other languages than English (e.g. Schadewaldt's *Iliasstudien*).

J. A. DAVISON.

University of Manchester.

Hans HERTER: *Vom Dionysischen Tanz zum komischen Spiel*. Pp. 59. Iserlohn: Silva-Verlag, 1947. Paper.

THE author sets out to trace the steps by which Attic Comedy came into being as a development of cult-dances by ithyphallic or (less frequently) theriomorphic dancers, wearing masks from the first, and (together with the phallus) a grotesquely padded costume, and representing demons of fertility who were brought into connexion with the worship of Dionysus. What is peculiar in his treatment is that he is very reluctant to admit Peloponnesian influence, and, finding in early Attic art some few traces of padded phallic figures like the well-known figures on certain Corinthian vases, he inclines to think that the actors (and their grotesque costume) as well as the choruses of Comedy were of Attic origin, and also that both chorus and actors wore the same costume. (The argument is too complicated to follow out here, but there seems to be no satisfactory evidence that the choruses of Attic Comedy ever wore the grotesque costume in question.)

He further identifies the dancers from whose performances Comedy sprang with those termed Ithyphalli, and since the evidence about these in primitive times is extremely scanty, he virtually depends on the description of them given by Semos of Delos, speaking of the ithyphalli of his own day. His treatment of these and their costume seems to be open to criticism; the ithyphalli of Semos are, *inter alia*, too remote in time to be safe guides to the origin of Comedy, and the great difference in costume between them and the actors of the Old Comedy is not successfully explained away.

The author, after ascribing the parabasis in particular to the supposed primitive ithyphalli, considers various ways in which they may next have found themselves engaged in an agon, and

gives his opinion that the actor (as Aristotle hints) developed out of their ἐξάρχων.

A satisfactory treatment of the subject needs much more space than the author has given it. Very few of the scattered data admit of only one interpretation, and they have been combined in all sorts of possible and impossible ways by different scholars. The notes give a great number of references to these, but with very little discussion.

A. W. PICKARD-CAMBRIDGE.

- (1) Sofocle: *Filottete* a cura di Angelo TACCONE.
- (2) Eschilo: *Le Coefore*, introduzione testo e commento, a cura di Giuseppe AMMENDOLA. (I Classici della Nuova Italia, 17, 18.) Pp. iv+172, pp. 204. Firenze: 'La Nuova Italia', 1948. Paper.

THESE editions, which are specimens of what appears to be a fairly comprehensive collection of Greek and Latin texts, will be of service to the young Italian students for whom they are presumably intended, though they contain little or nothing that will commend them to classical students in this country. The notes, which are very numerous and contain what is in effect an Italian translation of the greater part of the plays, cover a wide field. Interspersed with elaborate comments on the subject-matter are many explanations of quite elementary points of vocabulary, grammar, and syntax: e.g. *Phil.* 13 'τῶ: relat. = φ.—νν: = αὐτόν'; *Cho.* 89 (οὐδ' ἐχω τί φῶ) 'οὐδ(ἐ) . . . φῶ = neque habeo quid dicam'. The notes, together with the summaries which introduce the various sections of the plays, should supply an answer to almost every question that might puzzle an Italian schoolboy; whether the answer is always the right answer is more doubtful.

Neither editor shows much discretion in the face of textual problems and neither is very helpful as a metrician. Taccone calls attention to a tribrach in the fourth and a dactyl in the third foot of an iambic trimeter as if they were peculiar (*Phil.* 7. 10), but on σήμαν' εἶρ' ἐχει at the end of v. 22 he makes no metrical comment. Ammendola cheerfully defends κομίζει at *Cho.* 344, not apparently realizing that when Porson emended to κομίσουεν he was trying to mend the metre at least as much as the syntax, for νεοκράτα φίλον κομίζει is clearly inadmissible in an anapaestic system.

It is unfortunate that the editors are not more accurate in matters of detail, but it would perhaps be wrong to lay too much stress on such shortcomings. The object of both editors is to make the plays intelligible and interesting to beginners, and they set about their task with an enthusiasm which cannot fail to be stimulating. Each has made good use of the work which Italian and other scholars have done on these plays and has endeavoured with some success to elucidate the thought and explain the dramatic content. Taccone is particularly concerned with the characterization of Neoptolemus and Philoctetes; Ammendola both in the twenty-seven pages of his introduction and again in summaries and notes attached to the text gives a thorough and appreciative analysis of what he

calls 'La Tragedia della Vendetta'. The books are well printed and attractively produced.

R. M. RATTENBURY.

Trinity College, Cambridge.

Emil STAIGER: Euripides, *Ion*. Deutsch mit einer Einleitung. Pp. 66. Bern: Francke, 1947. Boards, 5.50 Sw. fr.

THE new series, 'Überlieferung und Auftrag', in which this volume appears, is designed to foster, and to reinterpret for the present generation, the humanistic tradition derived from antiquity and the Renaissance. It includes works of criticism as well as translations, and is further evidence of the vitality of classical studies in Switzerland to-day.

S.'s translation has no pretensions beyond providing a readable German version of the play. It is perhaps rather monotonous in rhythm, though varied in diction. It sticks very close to the Greek, but is not unfailingly accurate: for instance, the πρόσβροποι πέτρας of l. 11 find themselves 'im Norden Attikas'; θεός in l. 47 is surely not a god, but the god. There are a few notes at the end, mainly on mythological allusions which might puzzle a Greekless reader. In a brief but stimulating introduction S. discusses the artistic merits of the play. He is inclined to criticize the dramatist for involving his realistic characters in a conventional intrigue instead of pressing the personal and theological issues to a tragic conclusion. But this is perhaps to miss the relative lightness of tone of the whole play and to blame Euripides for failure in an enterprise from which he deliberately refrained.

R. P. WINNINGTON-INGRAM.

Birkbeck College, London.

Theocriti Carmina scholarum in usum edidit Kurt LATTE. Pp. 109. Iserlohn: Silva-Verlag, 1948. Paper.

THIS may not be the first classical text to appear in Germany since the war, but it is the first to come to my notice, and it is both a duty and a pleasure to extend a warm welcome to it.

The editor explains in his preface that the shortage of school-texts in Germany is acute, and that his choice of Theocritus was partly prompted by the opportunity of adducing the evidence of the papyri. He has employed them rather timorously, for some of their chief jewels (e.g. 2. 62 ἐντρούλῳσα, 165 λιπαρόβρονε) are left glittering in the *apparatus*, and others (most surprisingly 15. 99 διαχρήμενται) are denied even that setting; but his *apparatus* has the distinction of being the first printed north of the Alps to display pp. *Ant.*, *Berol.* 5017, and *Ox.* 1618, 1806, 2064. His text contains *Idd.* 1-17 in the order in which they are presented by K; then *Idd.* 18, 26, 28, 22, 24, 29, 30, 31, *Epigrams*. And this order, which is nowhere explained, earns him the less enviable distinction of being the first to separate the Aeolic lyrics.

The *apparatus*, we are told, *pendet e recentissimis editionibus*, but these, as we are also told, are those of Wilamowitz and Legrand. The name of Gallavotti is nowhere mentioned in the book, Wilamowitz's dating of the manuscripts is unmodified by

the corrections published by Wendel as long ago as 1920, and these are not the only indications that the editor is not familiar with the literature of his author. His text is, as it should be, unadventurous. It contains, in text or *apparatus*, half a dozen suggestions by the editor which he is to defend elsewhere, and two by Dr. Von der Mühl, one of which (the excision of 1. 51) leaves a text which I cannot construe.

It will appear from what I have said that this is not an important book. Its purpose did not require it to be so, and, if it had, the modesty of its preface would have disarmed criticism. Moreover, serious research has been difficult enough in England these ten years past, and has no doubt been still more difficult in Germany. My comments are for the information of readers of this journal, not in censure of the editor. But I think it sad that one whose time has been wasted by his predecessors' rearrangement of the poems should shuffle them once more after the evidence of the papyri has exposed the levity of such enterprises.

A. S. F. GOW.

Trinity College, Cambridge.

Diodorus of Sicily. With an English translation by Russel M. GEER. Vol. ix: Books xviii and xix, 1-65. (Loeb Classical Library.) Pp. xii+421; 2 maps. London, Heinemann, 1947. Cloth, 10s. 6d. net.

DR. GEER's volume ix is in every respect a worthy successor to the four volumes produced so admirably by Professor Oldfather. His translation is very readable and often exciting, as in the case of Cassander's siege of Pydna. It is also very accurate, and in such passages as xviii. 4, where the meaning of terms has been in dispute, his rendering is in accord with the view published recently by W. W. Tarn. The Introduction to the volume contains a clear and concise note on the sources of Books XVIII-XX, which states the problem and supplies the main evidence for identifying the chief source of Greek affairs with Hieronymus. To this is added a note on Diodorus' chronology; this makes difficult reading for the general reader because it tends to assume too high a degree of knowledge, as for instance of the incidence of the Attic archon-year. The *apparatus criticus*, as in the preceding volumes, covers the main variations of reading; Dr. Geer has also included in his text four of his own emendations, which are of some interest and do not alter the sense of Diodorus' text. The notes are concise and illuminate the geographical and historical context, and the cross-references to other passages in Diodorus and to other ancient authorities are especially valuable. In general these notes are appropriate and clear. Occasionally one feels that the general reader might receive more guidance concerning the value of Diodorus' statements; for example, a note on Alexander's so-called memoranda refers the reader to two articles but does not indicate that the genuineness of the memoranda has been widely questioned. The Index and the two pull-out maps are excellent. In short, Dr. Geer is to be warmly congratulated on his first volume of Diodorus, and

the printers equally on the clarity and correctness of their text.

N. G. L. HAMMOND.

Clare College, Cambridge.

Κυπριακαὶ Σπουδαὶ: Δελτίον τῆς Ἑταιρείας Κυπριακῶν Σπουδῶν. Τόμος Ε' (1941): pp. xii+132; 1 plate. *Τόμος Ζ' (1943):* pp. xvi+140; 4 plates. Nicosia: published for the Society, 1945. (Obtainable from Mr. K. Prousis, Παγκόσμιον Γυμνάσιον, Τ.Κ. ἀρ. 34, Nicosia.) Paper, 12s. net each.

THE Cypriote *Ἑταιρεία Κυπριακῶν Σπουδῶν* is to be congratulated (even if tardily) on the resumption of the publication of its periodical as soon as the end of hostilities in Europe made it possible. The paper is presumably such as was obtainable, and the plates have suffered; but the type is excellent.

Τόμος Ε', the number nominally for 1941, contains a single long paper, or rather book: a serious study of the history of Euagoras I, by Dr. K. Spyridakis, President of the Society. Dr. Spyridakis bases his narrative firmly on the original literary and numismatic sources, and makes due use of Meyer, Beloch, the *Cambridge Ancient History*, the work of Sir George Hill, etc. It is fitting that Cypriotes should have available in their own language a study by a Cypriote of one who was perhaps the island's most distinguished ruler.

Τόμος Ζ' contains articles, *inter alia*, by K. Spyridakis on the Monastery of the (Panaghia) Make-donitissa, near Nikosia; by K. Prousis on the historical ballads of Cyprus; by K. Chrysanthis, M.D., on Cypriote demotic names of diseases; by G. Papaharalambous on survivals of ancient games in the island; and by Miss E. Pitsillidou on ancient Cypriote sculpture. *Κυπριακαὶ Σπουδαὶ* is in short not only indispensable to anyone taking a special interest in the culture and history of Cyprus, but makes valuable contributions to a wide variety of Hellenic studies in general.

A. R. BURN.

University of Glasgow.

Ruth Mildred KELLER: *Iste Deiktikon in the Early Roman Dramatists.* (Transactions and Proceedings of the American Philological Association, vol. lxxvii.) Pp. 261-316. 1946.

THIS is an admirable piece of work. Miss Keller examines the evidence for the traditional view that *iste* is 'a demonstrative pronoun of the second person, used to refer to something near the person addressed in time, place, or thought; also to express contempt'; with which is linked the belief that *hic* is similarly associated with the first, *ille* with the third person. There is indeed plenty of evidence to support these views; the question is whether they are universally valid, and whether therefore wherever *iste* occurs, even in monologue, we should see in it a reference to the person addressed, the spectators, or some imaginary interlocutor, or alternatively some contemptuous force. There is further the general question whether in origin the demonstratives have any personal force whatever.

Miss Keller shows that there are numerous occurrences of *iste*, *hic*, and *ille* which no ingenuity can make to conform to the traditional view. Undoubtedly *iste* is found in contexts which express contempt; but so are *hic* and *ille* (e.g. *sycophantae huic*, *Trin.* 958; *huic mastigiaie*, *Capt.* 659; *illi mastigiaie*, *Capt.* 600; *flagitium illud hominis*, *Cas.* 155). In other contexts *iste* can, like *hic* and *ille*, express admiration or affection (e.g. *istaec est uirtus*, *As.* 323; *ne ista stimulum longum habet*, *Truc.* 853). Again *iste* can be used interchangeably with either *hic* or *ille*, or even both, by the same speaker when referring to the same person (cf. *Truc.* 436-46, where Diniarchus refers to Phronesium, who has left the stage, as *haec* . . . *illam* . . . *illi* . . . *huic* . . . *isti* . . . *istam* . . . *illi*). Any notion that *hic* is closely associated with the first person, *iste* with the second, and *ille* with the third, can hardly survive an unprejudiced study of, for example, *haec tua* (*Eun.* 1051-2); *illum tuum* (*Ad.* 395-6); *uostra haec* (*Ad.* 165); *illo nostro* (*Heaut.* 473); *isti nostri* (*Poen.* 811: here Bach emends to *uostri* in accordance with his theory); *istum meum* (*Trin.* 433-4). The attempt to explain all occurrences of *iste* in monologues as deuterotritonic leads to impossibly artificial results. The view (accepted even by Lindsay, *Captivi*, p. 129) that 'the disposition of the actors on the stage may be detected from the alternation of *hic*, *iste*, *ille* in the dialogue' would require the actors to shift their position 'with unbelievable speed', and not always in likely directions: cf. *Ep.* 573-4, and *Capt.* 546-728, where both Hegio and Aristophanes use in turn all three demonstratives in referring to Tyndarus.

Miss Keller's conclusion is that no personal or emotional force was originally attached to any of the demonstratives. The difference was one of more or less deictic force; *ille* was the weakest in this respect, *iste* the strongest: it threw, so to speak, a spotlight on the subject indicated. This strong deictic force rendered *iste* peculiarly suited for use in dialogue, where naturally a second person sense was often present. It also came to show on occasion a resumptive or else a preparatory force, and in dialogue the connotation might be derogatory, hypocoristic, or any shade of meaning between the two.

W. BEARE.

University of Bristol.

Sister M. Josephine BRENNAN, *A Study of the Clausulae in the Sermons of St. Augustine*. (Catholic University of America Patristic Studies, vol. lxxvii.) Pp. xviii+126. Washington, D.C.: The Catholic University of America Press, 1947. Paper.

THE series in which Sister Brennan's dissertation appears already includes investigations of *clausulae* in Hilary of Poitiers, Ambrose, Jerome, Gregory, Cassiodorus, and of the *De Civitate Dei* and *Confessions*. Sister Brennan has examined 11,877 sentence endings, in four sample groups, each covering a decade of preaching. Unfortunately her ear for quantity sometimes betrays her: e.g. she includes among types of the spondee *dichoree donis commemoravit, in scriptura dicit, nostro pec-*

catore, Petre diligis me (p. 41); under cretic *dichoree res securi petamus, nescimus quid petamus, perseverare velis* (p. 44); under trochee *dichoree dare noluerunt et clamantes in palude* (p. 46); under double cretic *dedit ubi scriptum est et ostendere dignatus est* (p. 53). But if there be no higher incidence of error in her whole 11,877 *clausulae* than in those of them she has quoted as types, there is no invalidation of the interesting results reached. Table III lists the incidence of the six most frequent *clausulae* in Cicero, Pliny, Cyprian, Ambrose, Jerome, Gregory, and five works of Augustine, whose usage on the whole comes nearest to that of Gregory. In forty years of preaching there is little change in the incidence of different *clausulae* in the *Sermons*, Augustine's extempore speaking style having presumably been formed in his pagan rhetorician days; but in his *Sermons* he is not metrical to the same degree as in the *De Civitate Dei* or the *De Doctrina Christiana*, and leans markedly to accentual *clausulae*, though with no attempt at the strict forms of the medieval *Cursus*. Analysis of *clausulae* in the light of these results supports Miss Mohrmann's view of the spuriousness of Denis Sermon 7 and Morin Sermons 8 and 9.

D. C. C. YOUNG.

University College, Dundee.

Sister Thomas Aquinas GOGGIN: *The Times of Saint Gregory of Nyssa as reflected in the Letters and the Contra Eunomium*. (Catholic University of America Patristic Studies, vol. lxxix.) Pp. xxiv+218. Washington D.C.: The Catholic University of America Press, 1947. Paper.

THE Catholic University of America has already published doctorate theses covering the 'Life and Times as revealed in' the works of Cyprian, Jerome, Augustine, Basil, and Synesius. The choice of Gregory of Nyssa as a source of social detail is a little surprising, for his letters are few and the *Contra Eunomium* is primarily dogmatic. But the author disarms criticism by recognizing 'the trivial and commonplace character of many of the references'. She modestly hopes to make 'a contribution to the comprehensive account of life in the fourth century which will one day be written'.

The work has been done with some care, and the result is not without interest and utility. Gregory must interest students of rhetoric, and two letters are really valuable, the one (20) describing an estate at Vanota, the other (25) discussing the architecture of a shrine and the problem of getting it built. Perhaps these letters should have been printed in full. Otherwise the thinness of the material is shown by the frequency with which an item will be made the most of under various heads. Nor has the author always avoided the danger of generalizing from one instance. Gregory's story that Eunomius' father, a farmer, carved wooden alphabets in the winter is (thrice!) recorded fairly, but occurs a fourth time as 'Carving was an important occupation of the farmer during the winter, and the chief product of this work was letters'. A curious remark under the heading 'Clergy' is: 'In the letters there is also a reference to a presbyter.'

As this is followed by a reference to priests (incorrectly, for *hieris* here means bishops), one wonders what the author understood by presbyter.

So Gregory does not prove a fertile source of general history. Doubtless it is good to know that not everyone agreed with the charitable saint in thinking halitosis a misfortune not deserving of censure.

The author has not discharged her task badly. But the responsible authorities might reconsider whether work of this kind should earn doctorates and (what is more important) whether this is the way to train scholars.

S. L. GREENSLADE.

University of Durham.

Arnaldo BISCARDI: *Manumissio per Mensam e Affrancazione Pretorie*. Pp. 92. Florence: Le Monnier, 1939. Paper, L. 30.

THEOPHILUS' paraphrase of Justinian's *Institutes* tells us that there were formerly three natural modes of manumission—*inter amicos*, *per mensam* (ὅτε συνεστράθησαν μοι ἐπὶ δευτερίας δοσε προσέτατον τῷ οἰκῆτῳ), and *per epistulam*; and the Visigothic Epitome of Gaius says 'Latini sunt qui aut per epistulam aut inter amicos aut convivii adhibitione manumittuntur'. Manumission by inviting a slave to table is also mentioned in an apocryphal passage under the name of Dionysius, Bishop of Alexandria 248–65; and it is inextricably mixed up with the familiar manumission *inter amicos* by the *Lex Romana Burgundionum*. All else is obscure.

Biscardi traces the Roman development of manumission *inter amicos*, which originally covered any informal expression of intent to free, including oral statement before witnesses, written declaration in a letter to the slave, and giving him (or destroying) the evidence of his slavery; *inter amicos* signifying 'in a friendly way', 'all amichevole', 'come si fa tra amici', rather than 'before witnesses'. Greek law is said, on evidence persuasive though scarcely conclusive, to have recognized manumission by inviting to dinner before 300 B.C. The practice was introduced to Italy about A.D. 300, when the Horatian custom of masters and slaves eating together had been displaced by the 'tendenza snobistica' of segregation, as in Greece. It was subsumed under the *φύσικοι τρόποι δευτερίας* in the Law Schools, first the Eastern and later the Western. Petronius' *Satyricon*, 70 and 71, describes a true *manumissio per mensam*, and cannot, therefore, in its present form, be older than the third century of our era. This conclusion is tentative, and will not convince all readers; but the evidence is discussed clearly, candidly, and sensibly, and the book is a valuable contribution to a difficult problem.

P. W. DUFF.

Trinity College, Cambridge.

Ernst LEVY: *Pauli Sententiae—a Palingenesia of the Opening Titles as a Specimen of Research in West Roman Vulgar Law*. Pp. xiv+131. Ithaca, N.Y.: Cornell University Press, 1945. Cloth, 16s. 6d. net.

THE work known as *Pauli Sententiae* is of peculiar importance for anyone studying the development of the law in Italy and in Byzantium between A.D. 250 and 540. The clarity and brevity of its statements made it immensely popular, and anyone compiling a law book in East or West tended to include extracts. We possess several such books, culminating in Justinian's *Digest* (533) and the Roman Law of the Visigoths, or *Breviarium* (506); and between them they preserve about a thousand Sentences. By analysing them, by comparing them with dated imperial enactments in the Codes of Theodosius and Justinian, and especially by comparing different versions of the same Sentence, much may be learned about the law, and the legal technique, of post-classical schools, Eastern and Western, of Justinian's compilers, and of the Visigoths; and the more we learn about post-classical changes, the more chance we have of discovering and understanding that 'classical' law which Justinian venerated, depraved, and, in its depraved form, preserved for all time.

Professor Levy is the greatest living authority on the Western developments, and he here takes us into his laboratory and plies the scalpel under our eyes. There is very little introduction, and to understand this book it is almost essential to read the author's *Vulgarization of Roman Law in the Early Middle Ages* (1943). Here he assumes, what he there argues, that the original *Libri Sententiarum* were collected from the works of Paul (Praetorian Praefect under Alexander Severus) by an epitomator not long before 300. This is now generally held; but Professor Volterra, whose opinion carries great weight, still maintained in 1934 that Paul himself made the *florilegium* from his own voluminous writings. Levy prints the first six titles of the first book, containing 83 Sentences, and the fifth-century *Interpretatio* attached to 14 of them in the *Breviarium*. He explains the meaning of every Sentence and discusses its origin, classical or post-classical, and its authorship, in its present form; and he concludes that 'the great majority appears to reveal the legal situation as it prevailed in Diocletian's time, a minority reflects changes during the next 150 years, roughly speaking, while the share of Justinian (or the Eastern schools) turns out to be very slight and that of Alaric non-existent'.

The book is too full of meat to be easy reading, but it is the kind of spade-work that is essential for building true doctrines; and its readers will look forward eagerly, but also with sober confidence, to the author's forthcoming treatise on 'West Roman Vulgar Law'.

P. W. DUFF.

Trinity College, Cambridge.

SUMMARIES OF PERIODICALS

ATHENAEUM

XXVI. i-ii (1948)

A. Levi, *Il concetto del tempo in Aristotele*: discusses in detail the Aristotelian theory of time and suggests that here can be found a foreshadowing of the views of both Plotinus and Sextus Empiricus. A. Barigazzi, *Euphronia*: attempts a reconciliation of the titles known from other sources with the notice in Suidas and examines in particular the *Σείνος* and *Χιλάδες*. G. Patroni, *L'inno omerico VI a Dioniso*: claims Homer as author, on the basis of a metrical analysis, particularly of verse-endings. M. Amelotti, *La ἐκχώρησις ed un papiro milanese inedito*: publishes for the first time a papyrus from Tebtunis (A.D. 105) dealing with an *ἐκχώρησις*, and examines this legal institution. A. Passerini, *La condizione della città di Elatea dopo la seconda guerra macedonica in una nuova iscrizione*: argues, from a new inscription from Stymphalus, published in *R.E.G.* lix-lx (1946-7) 149 ff., that the Elateans were expelled by the Aetolians and not by the Romans, and makes new suggestions for the lacunae in ll. 10 ff. of the inscription. V. De Falco, *Proposte di correzioni a testi alchimistici*: suggests numerous emendations of the texts in Berthelot-Ruelle. N. Alfieri, *I Fasti Consulares di Potentia (Regio V)*: publishes an inscription discovered by the author and giving the names of fifty-three consuls between A.D. 86 and 93, and fourteen between A.D. 112 and 116, of whom fifteen were previously unknown and ten of uncertain year.

XXVI. iii-iv (1948)

G. Tibiletti, *Il possesso dell' ager publicus e le norme de modo agrorum sino ai Gracchi* (cap. i-iii): makes an exhaustive examination of the ancient authorities and gives a comprehensive survey of early legislation relating to the *ager publicus*. C. Albizzati, *Varia de Centuriis*: reaffirms A.'s position in the polemic on the alleged hellenistic works of art from Centuriipae (cf. *Ath.* xx (1942), 61 ff.). A. Degrassi, *Mittente e destinatario dei rescritti imperiali riguardanti il municipio di Vardacate*: corrects the reading of the *praescriptio* (cf. *Ath.* xx (1942), 1-10) to make Augustus the sender. A. Garzetti, *Sui Lepontii*: supports the view that the Lepontii of the Heliopolis inscription (*Année épigr.*, 1939, n. 60) are a small group isolated from the main body of Lepontii.

CLASSICAL PHILOLOGY

XLIII. 2: APRIL, 1948

Carl Roebuck, *The Settlements of Philip II with the Greek States in 338 B.C.*: examines Philip's policy in the agreements which he made with the several Greek states in preparation for his League of Corinth. M. L. Carlson, *Pagan Examples of Fortitude in Latin Christian Apologists*: illustrates the way in which Christian writers took over the *exempla* of the rhetorical tradition and used them to support new arguments. Friedrich Solmsen,

Propertius and Horace: connects the change of attitude and theme in *Prop.* iii. 1-5 with the appearance of *Odes* i-iii and particularly iii. 30 *exegi monumentum*. V. B. Schuman, *The Indiana University Papyri*: restored text of ten short business documents, with commentary. Charles Edson, *Philip V and Alcaeus of Messene*: argues against Walbank that A.'s epigrams give no evidence for believing that he began by being pro-Macedonian; *A.P.* ix. 518 is not laudatory but sarcastic mockery; vii. 412 and ix. 588 need not have any political implication.

(XLIII. 3: July 1948 is summarized on p. 37.)

XLIII. 4: OCTOBER, 1948

C. C. Coulter, *Boccaccio and the Cassinese Manuscripts of the Laurentian Library*: examines the evidence for Boccaccio's life and the history of his library and concludes that Mediceus II of Tacitus, F of Apuleius, and the Laurentian Varro were removed from Monte Cassino not by B. but (perhaps) by Niccolò Acciaiuolo. Adolf Berger, *A Labour Contract of A.D. 164*: analyses the juristic and economic implications of the Dacian wax-tablet *C.I.L.* iii, p. 948, n. x. D. J. Georgacas, *On the Nominal Endings -is, -iv in Later Greek*: -iv became -v in the Koine by the development -iv → -ivv → -vv → -v: -ivv became -is by analogy. F. P. Johnson, *Who Built the Wall of Rome?*: ascribes the building of the 'second period' wall to Probus rather than Maxentius.

XLIV. 1: JANUARY, 1949

M. P. Cunningham, *Some Poetic Uses of the Singular and Plural of Substantives in Latin*: attempts to find a general formula for the uses of sing. and plur. from consideration of *ripa, litus, aqua*, and other words. F. W. Walbank, *Roman Declaration of War in the Third and Second Centuries*: presents evidence for a conditional war-motion approved in advance before the formal *rerum repetitio*, which could be followed immediately by *demunitatio*, in 238-7 (Carthage) as in 218 (Carthage) and 200 (Macedon). C. G. Starr, *Epictetus and the Tyrant*: E.'s tyrant is not a type but a real person, Domitian, and E. adapts Stoic philosophy, in the light of political experience, to meet the problems of life under a tyranny which might be repeated. G. L. Hendrickson, *Vates Biformis*: in *Od.* ii. 20. 9 ff., as *iam iam* shows, Horace is still imaginatively contemplating the future, not describing his metamorphosis as present. N. Lewis, *Dio Chrysostom's Tyrant of Syria*: P. Tebt. 698 confirms Porphyry's indication that the reference is to Antiochus Epiphanes.

ERANOS

XLVI. iii-iv (1948)

E. P. Papanoutsos, *La Catharsis aristotélécienne*: as spectators of tragedy we feel not ordinary but tragic pity and fear, which are rational emotions, duly proportioned and in harmony with orderliness of soul; catharsis of the ordinary emotions

causes them to take this form. K. Meister, *Zur Datierung der Annalen des Tacitus und zur Geschichte der Provinz Ägypten*: the phrase *Romani imperii quod nunc Rubrum ad mare palescit* (Ann. ii. 61) does not refer to Trajan's Parthian campaign of 114-16, but to an extension of the province of Egypt to the Red Sea, probably about 105. Ann. ii. 56 and iv. 4 must be earlier than 114, and so the first part of the *Annals* may be dated between 105 and 114; the later book, which differs stylistically, may belong to Hadrian's reign. The article shows that *Rubrum mare* most commonly means the Red Sea, and that *imperium Romanum* is used strictly of the provinces, excluding spheres of influence (in which more or less permanent garrisons were sometimes found); it traces the inclusion within the boundaries of Egypt of what was at first only such a sphere of influence along the Red Sea. E. Svenberg, *Trois passages de la Vulgate*: Luke ii. 17, *cognosco* occasionally means 'make known'; Matt. vi. 20, *effodiunt* for *diopisat* is due to the familiarity of the idea of digging up treasure; Acts xix. 35, the translation of *diopisat* by *Iovisque prolis* may be explicable by Schol. Od. iv. 447 where *diopisat* and *diopisat* are equated. S. Cavallin, *Les clauses des hagiographes arléziennes*: the *Life of Honoratus* (first half of 5th century) has quantitative clausulae. The *Life of Hilarius* (early 6th century) shows the *cursor planus*, *tardus*, or *velox* in 92 per cent. of endings before a heavy stop, but the great majority of these are also good quantitative clausulae; the writer probably intended others to be, but made mistakes in scansion; his carefulness is shown by the complete absence of disyllabic final words, and his practice is very like that recommended by M. Plotius Sacerdos (Keil, *G.L.*, vol. vi). The *Life of Caesarius* (mid 6th century) is, in the first book, very like that of Hilarius, but less attention is paid to quantity. MISCELLANEA: F. Orluf, *De Ovidii Fast.* 2, 398 *interpretando*; E. L. B. Meurig Davies, *Adversaria* on Amm. Marc. 15. 8. 15 and 20. 5. 8, 16. 12. 58, 18. 6. 16, and Curt. 3. 13. 4; M. P. Nilsson, *A propos d'une inscription de Maclaur* shows that this inscription (*Compte rendu de l'Acad. des inscriptions* 1948) is inspired by Virgil rather than astral mysticism; A. Nelson, *Über den Ursprung des lateinischen Terminus Sortes*, *Sor in der philosophischen Literatur des Mittelalters*, shows that Aristotle used the name Socrates, of which this is an admitted corruption, to mean X, and that Callias and Coriscus, which he uses in the same way, are also found in medieval philosophers. Erik Gren, *Bibliografisk översikt*, surveys the most important classical books (and some articles) that appeared in 1947.

PHILOLOGUS

97. 1/2 (1948)

R. Bultmann, *Zur Geschichte der Lichtsymbolik im Altertum*: examines early associations of *φῶς* (= *ὀφθαλμός*) and relation of seeing and knowing in, e.g., *Rep.* vi, then traces concept of *φῶς* as 'Kraftsubstanz' and consequences for later philosophy, gnostics, and Plotinus. K. Latte, *De nonnullis papyris Oxyrrhynchis*: 2176 (metre is

ia. trim. + ia. dim.; Cicon a *hariolus*; commentary of Imperial date); 2175, fr. 2, 7 (capital T for -oo in Asia Minor inscr.); 2164 is from Aesch. *Semele*, not *Xantriai* (note on *ὄψεως*); 2173 and Callim. fr. 230 (poem for a Nemean victory). E. Siegmann, *Die neuen Aischylos-Bruchstücke*: treats fully Oxy. P. 2159 ff.; 2159 is from a shepherd's description of appearance of Glaucus (? prologue); 2160 fr. 1 and 2, ii from messenger's speech: setting of play Corinth. S.'s restorations of 2161 assume 786-832 spoken by Silenus and chorus with 802, 804-11 metrically ~ 812-20. B. Snell, *Das früheste Zeugnis über Sokrates*: interprets Eur. *Hipp.* 380 ff. as a reply to a Socratic argument directed against *Med.* 1077 ff. and sketches implications. Is the twofold *Αἰδώς* Socratic? Relation of Socrates to Protagoras (Pl. *Prot.* 352 d) and to Eur. and Ar. *Nub.* M. Pohlenz, *NOMOS*: examines relation of *νόμος* to *νέμεν*, *νομῶν*, &c.; from *√NEM* epos only formed *νόμος* in a purely local sense; gradually (cf. formula *ἡθεα καὶ νομοῖς*) both *νομός* and *νόμος* came to exist side by side. K. Latte, *Augur und Templum in der varronischen Auguralformel*: V.'s own view of passage in *L.L.* vii. 8; text; analysis of *conregio*, *cortumio*, *tescum*, &c.; augurs and pontifices (cf. Cic. *Leg.* ii. 21). Ernst Fraenkel, *Zur gr. und lat. Grammatik und Wortforschung*: treats pre-Alexandrian hypernormalization and Latin hyperurbanization; *χαλδῶν* and *ἀρδῶν*; *βραδύς* as distinct from *ἀνέρεω*, *ἀνέρεω*; Latin *struere* and Lit. *struntyti*; Osc. *lamartir*: interesting Baltic and Slavonic parallels. 'Miscellen' include notes on Ludovisi Throne; Antigonus' letter to Teans (303 B.C.); Hor. *Sat.* i. 2 and Callim. *Ep.* 31; Homeric helmets; Cratinus fr. 244 K.; Herodian, π. παθῶν fr. 583 L.; Pliny, *Epp.* x; Virg. *Aen.* iii init. 'Randbemerkungen' are short notices of books received: the editors hope that this new feature may be useful in the absence of *Gnomon* and *Phil. Woch.*

RIVISTA DI FILOLOGIA CLASSICA

N.S. XXV: i-ii (1947)

A. Rostagni, *Questioni biografiche*: I. *Premessa quasi metodologica*: promises a series of notes on literary biography, mainly expansions of points in his *Suetonio 'de Poetis' e Biografi Minori*; II. *Gli 'scripta' di Virgilio nel testamento del poeta*: supports the authenticity of the passage in Suetonius-Donatus and refuses to limit 'scripta' to the *Aeneid*; III. *L'Epigramma di Sulpicio e il Salvataggio dell' 'Eneide'*: rejects the identification of Sulpicius the Carthaginian with C. Sulpicius Apollinaris and suggests that the real author of the epigram was a hitherto unknown Ser. Sulpicius Varus, 'Carthaginiensis' being a later gloss by someone who knew that Apollinaris came from Carthage. L. Perelli, *Il Piano Originario del Poema Lucreziano alla Luce del suo Svolgimento Ideale*: accepts Mewaldt's view that Book IV was originally intended to precede Book III, but argues (against Diels's 'three-stage' theory) that the signs of growing pessimism in Lucretius' attitude to the universe prove the original order to have been I, II; IV, III; V, VI. I. Lana, *Terenzio e il Movimento Filenico in Roma*: discusses cer-

tain aspects of Terentian comedy (especially the contrast between his indirect descriptions of *meretrices* and the characters they reveal when they appear to speak for themselves) on the assumption that Terence was attempting to show Romans 'la vita alla greca' in a more favourable light than had that darling of Cato and the Tories, Plautus—hence the opposition of which Terence complained in his prologues (to be continued). B. Lavagnini, *Solone e il Voto Obbligatorio*: interprets the evidence for Solon's law requiring all citizens to take a side in any *stasis*, and concludes that Solon's intention was to deter would-be tyrants; an examination of sixth-century Attic history shows how completely he failed, and suggests that it was this failure which led Cleisthenes to introduce ostracism. S. Accame, *Alceo di Messene, Filippo V e Roma*: considers Alcaeus' epigram on Philip V (A.P. 9.518) and the imitations A.P. 9.526 and 6.171; he dates the last between 189 and 167 B.C., connects Alcaeus' epigram with Philip's victories about 201 B.C., argues from A.P. 7.247 and 16.5 that at the time of Cynoscephalae Alcaeus' sympathies were with the Aetolians rather than the Romans, and concludes that the intention of 9.518 is not satirical, as Walbank argues in C.Q. xxxvi-xxxviii, but seriously complimentary. E. Manni, *L'Acclamazione di Valeriano*: claims that only the literary evidence for Valerian's accession can be accepted, and concludes that the salutation of Valerian took place after the death of Trebonianus, and that Valerian saw himself as the avenger of Trebonianus. E. V. Marmorale, *Sul Testo di un Verso di Cicerone*: supports *laudi* against *linguae* in fr. 16 Morel (10 Baehrens). Reviews. Publications received.

N.S. XXV: iii-iv (1947)

E. Caldera, *Sulle Fonti dell' 'Amphitruo'*: uses the geographical errors in the *Amphitruo* as evidence that Plautus was not imitating a Greek comedy, but freely parodying a Greek tragedy, probably Euripides' *Alcmena*. I. Lana, *Terenzio e il Movimento Filhellénico in Roma* (continued): considers the part played by Ambivivus in the 'Philhellenic movement', discusses in some detail the *Adelphi*, 'in cui la commedia, veramente, per la prima volta, serva ad un intento educativo, dibattendolo un problema sociale-pedagogico', explains Terence's final journey to Greece as the beginning of a new era in the relations between *Graecia capta* and her conqueror, and concludes that the absolute value of Terence's work as poetry is reduced by his preoccupation with social and political propaganda. L. Alfonsi, *La Biografia Tibulliana di Siccio Polenton*: discusses the sources of Siccio's life of Tibullus, and concludes that he had access either to some 'silloge' unknown to us or, more probably, to a complete text of Tibullus. M. A. Levi, *La Composizione delle 'Res Gestae Divi Augusti'*: agrees with Syme that the inscription is unique in the sense that it has no true precedent in Latin epigraphy, but argues that parallels can be found in Oriental and Hellenistic monarchies; he discusses the arrangement of the text and rejects all theories of rigid division—he argues for a strict unity of plan, uniting Roman

legal and religious ideas with Hellenistic-Oriental ideas about the exaltation of a head of state in the affirmation by Augustus both of his close affinity with the heroic 'Cosmocratores' from Darius I to Alexander (and even Cleopatra) and of his connexion with, and superiority to, such great Romans as the Scipios, Sulla, Pompeius, and Julius. E. Manni, *La Lotta di Sétimio Severo per la Conquista del Potere*: evaluates the sources for the history of the period from the death of Commodus to the final establishment of Severus and discusses the chronology of Pescennius' and Severus' revolts, the position of Clodius Albinus in Britain, the motives of the war between Severus and Clodius, and the fictitious adoption of Severus into the Antonine family. M. Guarducci, *Una Dedicca dei Pierii a Delfi*: identifies a Delphian inscription first published by Amandry in B.C.H. lxiii, 1939, 216 ff. as a dedication by the Pierians and discusses the connexions of Pieria with Delphi and the meaning of *πéλαγος*. G. Vitucci, *Note al 'Cursus Honorum' di M. Iulius Romulus praefectus frumenti dandi ex S.C.*: deals with an inscription from Velletri (*Not. Scav.*, 1924, 346 f.) and discusses especially the phrases 'legatus pro praetore prouinciae', 'legatus pro praetore iterum prouinciae Asiae' and 'praefectus frumenti dandi ex S.C.'. Reviews. Publications received.

N.S. XXVI: i-ii (1948)

M. Untersteiner, *Studi sulla Sofistica: Il Proemio dei 'Caratteri' di Teofrasto e un probabile Frammento di Ippia*: suggests that the proemium to Theophrastus' *Characters* should be divided into two at § 4 *ὁρθῶς λέγω*, and that the first part should be recognized as a fragment of Hippias of Elis. V. Bartoletti, *Euforione e Partenio*: argues that the Trambelos-Apiate papyrus of Euphorion (fr. 121b in Page, *Greek Literary Papyri*, i) proves that Parthenius paid little attention to Euphorion's version of the story. I. Lana, *Sull' Elegia III. 14 di Propertio*: considers the ancient evidence for the athletic activities of Spartan girls and concludes that in this elegy Propertius demonstrates his independence not only of Greek sources and models but also of the moral ideas of Augustus. L. Alfonsi, *Petronio e i Teodoresi*: points to the omission of Lysias from Encolpius' tirade in *Satyr. 2* and the inclusion of Plato, Demosthenes, Thucydides, and Hyperides as evidence for the influence of the Theodorean school (middle first century A.D.) on Petronius, and so for the date of the *Satyricon*. G. Boano, *Sul 'De Reditu Suo' di Rutilio Namaziano*: considers the relation of Rutilius' poem to the philosophy of Posidonius, the Hermetic philosophy, the cult of Isis, and the circle in which Macrobius produced the *Saturnalia*, and the bearing of these points on the identification of the poet with the Rutilius of the *Querolus*. G. Bendinelli, *Gruppo Fittile di Enea e Anchise proveniente da Veio*: suggests that the Veientine terracottas of an armoured Aeneas carrying Anchises on his left shoulder derive from a Greek bronze statue dedicated at Veii before the decade 470-460 B.C. to a deity whose Etruscan name was equivalent to Pietas-Eusebeia. Reviews. Publications received.

N.S. XXVI: iii-iv (1948)

A. Barigazzi, *Sulle Fonti del Libro I delle Tuscolane*: argues that Aristotle, not Posidonius, was Cicero's main source for *Tusc. Disp.* i. L. Moretti, *Sparta alla Metà del VI. Secolo* (continued from Vol. N.S. xxiv): discusses II. the war against Argos for the Thyreatis, dating it c. 550 and explaining the 300 as the picked body of Spartiates which replaced the *Hippeis*, and III. the story of a Spartan alliance with Croesus, which he regards as extremely improbable. M. Guarducci, *L'Origine e le Vicende del γένος Ἀττικοῦ dei Salaminii*: argues that the Salaminii derived their name from the fact that their original lands were in Salamis, probably in the seventh century, and that they had to take refuge in mainland Attica when Salamis was taken by the Megarians in Solon's time; she discusses inscriptions relating to the *genos* and (in an appendix) the text and dating of the Salaminian decree (IG. i². 1). A. D'Accinni, *La Data della Salita al*

Trono di Diocleziano: argues that in *P.Oxy.* 2187 the date 'Hathyr 11' (= November 7) refers not to A.D. 303 but to 302, that Segrè (in *J.E.A.* xxx, 1944, 77) was wrong to use the papyrus as confirmation that Diocletian's *vicennalia* had already been celebrated by 7 November 303, and that there is no need to suppose that Diocletian came to the throne on 17 September 284. G. M. Bersanetti, *Valeriano ed Emiliano*: accepts Manni's view (above, N.S. xxv. i-ii) that Valerian's salutation followed the death of Trebonianus, but rejects his theory that Valerian was the avenger of Trebonianus and the heir of his policy; Valerian was simply a military usurper and his policy resembled Aemilian's more closely than it did Trebonianus'. F. Castagnoli, *Cippo di 'Restitutio Agrorum' presso Canne*: discusses and completes an inscription found near Cannae in 1938, which records a 'restitutio finium agrorum publicorum' in Vespasian's seventh consulship (76); parallels are given. Reviews. Publications received.

BOOKS RECEIVED

All publications which have a bearing on classical studies will be entered in this list if they are sent for review. The price should in all cases be stated.

- Albenque (A.) *Les Rutènes. Études d'Histoire, d'Archéologie et de Toponymie Gallo-Romaines.* Pp. xii + 339. Paris: Picard, 1949. Paper, 550 fr.
- Ball (M. T.) *Nature and the Vocabulary of Nature in the Works of St. Cyprian.* (Patristic Studies, vol. 75.) Pp. xix + 303. Washington, D.C.: Catholic University of America Press, 1946. Paper.
- Barrington-Ward (J. G.), Bell (J.), Bowra (C. M.), Bryan-Brown (A. N.), Denniston (J. D.), Higham (T. F.), and Platnauer (M.) *Some Oxford Compositions.* Pp. xxxvi + 324. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1949. Cloth, 21s. net.
- Brellich (A.) *Die geheime Schutzgottheit von Rom. (Albae Vigiliae, 6.)* Pp. 65. Zürich: Rhein-Verlag, 1949. Paper, 8 Sw. fr.
- Bultmann (R.) *Das Urchristentum im Rahmen der antiken Religionen.* Pp. 263. Zürich: Artemis-Verlag, 1949. Boards, 11.80 Sw. fr.
- Buller (H. E.) *The Chronicle of Jocelin of Breke-lond. Latin text with English translation, introduction, notes, and appendices.* (Nelson's Medieval Classics.) Pp. xxviii + 167. Edinburgh and London: Nelson, 1949. Cloth, 15s. net.
- Cazzaniga (I.) *Note Ambrosiane: Appunti intorno allo Stile delle Omelie Virginali.* Pp. 95. Milan: Istituto Editoriale Cisalpino, 1948. Paper.
- Chantraine (P.) *Xénophon: Économique. Texte établi et traduit.* (Collection Budé.) Pp. 119. Paris: 'Les Belles Lettres', 1949. Paper.
- Clayton (F. W.) *Some Aspects of Latin Stoicism. (Inaugural Lecture.)* Pp. 34. Paper.
- Cleve (F. M.) *The Philosophy of Anaxagoras. An attempt at reconstruction.* Pp. xix + 167. New York: King's Crown Press (London: Oxford University Press), 1949. Cloth, 16s. net.
- Commemorative Studies in Honor of Theodore Leslie*
- Shear.* (Hesperia: Supplement VIII.) Pp. xi + 433; 64 plates. Princeton, N.J.: American School of Classical Studies at Athens, 1949. Paper, \$15.
- della Corte (F.) *Catone Censore: la Vita e la Fortuna.* Pp. 190. Turin: Rosenberg & Sellier, 1949. Paper, L. 1600 (\$2.80).
- della Valle (E.) *Menandro: I Contendenti. Versione e integrazione poetica.* Pp. 154. Bari: Laterza, 1949. Paper.
- de Vries (G. J.) *Spel bij Plato.* Pp. 391. Amsterdam: Noord-Hollandsche Uitgevers Mij., 1949. Cloth, f. 9.50.
- Dumbarton Oaks Papers.* Number Four. Edited for the Dumbarton Oaks Research Library and Collection of Harvard University. Pp. 305. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press (London: Oxford University Press), 1949. Cloth, 42s. net.
- Dunlop (J. E.) *Vergil's Aeneid II.* (Alpha Classics.) Pp. 128; 10 illus. London: Bell, 1949. Cloth, 3s.
- Edsman (C. M.) *Ignis Divinus. Le Feu comme Moyen de Rajeunissement et d'Immortalité: Contes, Légendes, Mythes et Rites.* (Skrifter utgivna av Vetenskaps-Societeten Lunds, 34.) Pp. 306. Lund: Gleerup, 1949. Paper, kr. 13.
- Emerita.* Tomo XV. Pp. 335. Madrid: Consejo Superior de Investigaciones Científicas, 1947. Paper.
- Festugière* (A. J.) *La Révélation d'Hermès Trismégiste. II: Le Dieu Cosmique.* Pp. xvii + 611. Paris: Gabalda, 1949.
- Friedländer (P.) *Epigrammata. Greek Inscriptions in Verse from the Beginnings to the Persian Wars.* Pp. 198. Berkeley, Calif.: University of California Press (London: Cambridge University Press), 1949. Cloth, 27s. 6d. net.

- Gigon* (O.) *Epikur. Übertragen und eingeleitet*. Pp. 1+134. Zürich: Artemis-Verlag, 1949. Cloth.
- Goldschmidt* (V.) *La Religion de Platon*. Pp. xii+158. Paris: Presses Universitaires de France, 1949. Paper, 200 fr.
- Haavhøff* (T. J.) *Vergil the Universal*. Pp. 126. Oxford: Blackwell, 1949. Cloth, 8s. 6d. net.
- Höistad* (R.) *Cynic Hero and Cynic King. Studies in the Cynic Conception of Man*. Uppsala: privately printed (Oxford: Blackwell), 1949. Paper, 12s. net.
- Jaspers* (K.) *Vom Ursprung und Ziel der Geschichte*. Pp. 360. Zürich: Artemis-Verlag, 1949. Cloth.
- Johnson* (A. C.) and *West* (L. C.) *Byzantine Egypt: Economic Studies*. (Princeton Studies in Papyrology, No. 6.) Pp. viii+344. Princeton: University Press (London: Oxford University Press), 1949. Cloth, 27s. 6d. net.
- Kleiner* (G.) *Alexanders Reichsmünzen*. (Abh. der deutschen Akad. der Wiss. zu Berlin, phil.-hist. Klasse, 1947, No. 5.) Pp. 55; 1 plate. Berlin: Akademie-Verlag, 1949. Paper, DM 5.50.
- Knight* (W. F. J.) *St. Augustine's De Musica*. Pp. 125. London: Orthogonal Institute, 1949. Cloth and boards, 12s. 6d. net.
- Koller* (H.) *Die Komposition des platonischen Symposions*. Pp. 112. Zürich: Leemann, 1948. Paper.
- Krans* (W.) *Empedokles*. Pp. 393. Zürich: Artemis-Verlag, 1949. Boards, 13.80 Sw. fr.
- Labourt* (J.) *Saint Jérôme: Lettres. Texte établi et traduit. Tome I (i-xxii)*. (Collection Budé.) Pp. lxxvii+170. Paris: 'Les Belles Lettres', 1949. Paper.
- Latte* (K.) *Theocriti carmina*. Pp. 109. Iserlohn, Westf.: Silva-Verlag, 1949. Paper.
- Levi* (M. A.) *Nerone e i suoi tempi*. Pp. 234. Milan: Istituto Editoriale Cisalpino, 1949. Paper, L. 1000.
- Lundström* (S.) *Neue Studien zur Lateinischen Irenäusübersetzung*. (Lunds Universitets Årsskrift, N.F., Avd. 1, Bd. 44, Nr. 8.) Pp. 234. Lund: Gleerup, 1948. Paper.
- Marmorale* (E. V.) *Cato Maior. Seconda edizione*. Pp. 266. Bari: Laterza, 1949. Paper.
- Meloni* (P.) *Il Regno di Caro Numeriano e Carino*. (Ann. della Facoltà di Lettere e Filosofia della Università di Cagliari, XV. ii.) Pp. 223. Cagliari: Università, 1948. Paper.
- Meloni* (P.) *Servio Sulpicio Rufo e i suoi tempi. Studio biografico*. (Annali della Facoltà di Lettere e Filosofia della Università di Cagliari, XIII.) Pp. 181. Sassari: Gallizzi, 1946. Paper.
- Meritt* (B. D.), *Wade-Gery* (H. T.), and *McGregor* (M. F.) *The Athenian Tribute Lists. Volume II*. Pp. ix+125; 16 plates. Princeton, N.J.: American School of Classical Studies at Athens, 1949. Cloth, \$10.
- Minio-Paluello* (L.) *Aristotelis Categoriae et Libri de Interpretatione*. (Scriptorum Classicorum Bibliotheca Oxoniensis.) Pp. xxiii+96. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1949. Cloth, 7s. 6d. net.
- Nordh* (A.) *Libellus de Regionibus Urbis Romae*. (Skrifter utgivna av Svenska Institutet i Rom 8^e, III.) Pp. 113. Lund: Gleerup, 1949. Paper, kr. 10.
- Olmstead* (A. T.) *The History of the Persian Empire*. Pp. xix+568; 70 plates, maps. Chicago: University Press (London: Cambridge University Press), 1949. Cloth, 55s. net.
- Pariente* (A.) *Estudios de Fonética y Morfología Latina*. (Acta Salamanticensia: Filosofía y Letras, II. 3.) Pp. 347. Salamanca: University, 1949. Paper, 95 ptas.
- Pinner* (H. L.) *The World of Books in Classical Antiquity*. Pp. 64; 11 plates, 2 figs. Leyden: Sijthoff (London: Allen & Unwin), 1949. Cloth, 8s. 6d. net.
- Raubitschek* (A. E.) *Dedications from the Athenian Acropolis. A Catalogue of the Inscriptions of the Sixth and Fifth Centuries B.C.* Pp. xv+545. Cambridge, Mass.: Archaeological Institute of America, 1949. Cloth.
- Reinhardt* (K.) *Aischylos als Regisseur und Theologe*. Pp. 168. Bern: Francke, 1949. Boards, 9.60 Sw. fr.
- Richard* (M.) *Répertoire des Bibliothèques et des Catalogues de Manuscrits Grecs*. (Centre National de la Recherche Scientifique: Publications de l'Institut de Recherche et d'Histoire des Textes, I.) Pp. xv+131. Paris: Centre de Documentation du C.N.R.S., 1948. Paper.
- Robertson* (C. M.) *Why Study Greek Art?* (Inaugural Lecture, University College, London.) Pp. 13. London: H. K. Lewis, 1949. Paper, 2s. net.
- Romero* (N.) *L'argument historique et la prononciation du latin*. Pp. 105. Rio de Janeiro: Olympio, 1948. Paper.
- Rüdiger* (H.) *Griechische Lyriker. Griechisch und deutsch. Eingeleitet und neu übertragen*. Pp. 352; 5 plates. Zürich: Artemis-Verlag, 1949. Cloth.
- Ruysschaert* (J.) *Juste Lipse et les Annales de Tacite. Une méthode de critique textuelle au XIV^e siècle*. (Université de Louvain, Recueil de Travaux d'Histoire et de Philologie, 3^e série, fasc. 34.) Pp. xviii+222. Louvain: Bibliothèque de l'Université, 1949. Paper.
- Sedgewick* (G. G.) *Of Irony, especially in Drama*. Pp. ix+127. Toronto: University Press (London: Oxford University Press), 1948. Cloth, 15s. net.
- Simenschy* (T.) *La Construction du Verbe dans les Langues Indo-Européennes*. Pp. xii+279. Jassy: Terek, 1949. Paper.
- Stolte* (B. H.) *De Cosmog. van den Anonymus Ravennas. Een Studie over de Bronnen van Boek II-V*. Pp. xi+130. Zundert: privately printed, 1949. Paper.
- Strömberg* (R.) *Grekiska Ordspraak. En Antologi översatt och försedd med korta Förklaringar*. Pp. 63. Göteborg: Wettergren & Kerber, 1949. Paper, 7 kr.
- Taylor* (L. R.) *Party Politics in the Age of Caesar*. (Sather Classical Lectures, vol. xxii.) Pp. ix+255. Berkeley & Los Angeles: University of California Press (London: Cambridge University Press), 1949. Cloth, \$3.50.
- Thompson* (D. B.) *Swans and Amber. Some early Greek lyrics freely translated and adapted*. Pp. xii+193. Toronto: University Press (London: Oxford University Press), 1949. Cloth, 15s. net.

- Thomson (G.) *Studies in Ancient Greek Society: the Prehistoric Aegean*. Pp. 622; 85 text-figs., 18 tables, 12 maps. London: Lawrence & Wishart, 1949. Cloth, 42s. net.
- Tzannetatos (T. S.) *Συμμετὰ Φιλολογικά*. Pp. 40. Athens: 'Hestia', 1949. Paper, 7000 dr.
- Untersteiner (M.) *Sofisti: testimonianze e frammenti*. (Biblioteca di Studi Superiori, n. 4.) Pp. xxii+124. Florence: La Nuova Italia, 1949. Paper, L. 1000.
- van der Valk (M. H. A. L. H.) *Textual Criticism of the Odyssey*. Pp. 296. Leiden: Sijthoff, 1949. Paper, fl. 14.50.
- van Groningen (B. A.) *Vier Voordrachten over de Griekse Tragedie*. Pp. 51. Leiden: Stenfert Kroese, 1949. Paper, fl. 2.75.
- Vogt (J.) *Constantin der Grosse und sein Jahrhundert*. Pp. 303. Munich: Münchner Verlag, 1949. Cloth, DM. 14.50.
- Ward-Perkins (J. B.) *The Italian Element in Late Roman and Early Medieval Architecture*. (British Academy: Annual Italian Lecture, 1947.) Pp. 32; 8 plates. London: Oxford University Press, 1949. Paper, 7s. 6d. net.
- Warner (R.) *Xenophon: The Persian Expedition*. A new translation. Pp. 309. West Drayton: Penguin Books, 1949. Paper, 1s. 6d. net.
- Webster (T. B. L.) *The Interplay of Greek Art and Literature*. (Inaugural Lecture.) Pp. 20. London: H. K. Lewis, 1949. Paper, 3s. net.
- Wehrli (F.) *Demetrios von Phaleron. (Die Schule des Aristoteles: Texte und Kommentar, Heft IV.)* Pp. 89. Basel: Schwabe, 1949. Paper, 11 Sw. fr.
- Wellesz (E.) *A History of Byzantine Music and Hymnography*. Pp. xiv+358; 5 plates. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1949. Cloth, 42s. net.
- Wendel (C.) *Die griechisch-römische Buchbeschreibung verglichen mit der des vorderen Orients*. (Hallische Monographien, Nr. 3.) Pp. viii+149. Halle: Niemeyer, 1949. Paper, DM. 16.
- Whitfield (J. H.) *Dante and Virgil*. Pp. 106. Oxford: Blackwell, 1949. Cloth, 8s. 6d. net.
- Wordsworth (J.) and White (H. J.) *Novum Testamentum Domini Nostri Iesu Christi latine secundum editionem Sancti Hieronymi. Partis tertiae fasciculus secundus. Epistulas Iacobi, Petri, Iudae recensuit H. F. D. Sparks, Epistulas Iohannis rec. A. W. Adams*. Pp. 230-405. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1949. Paper, 21s. net.
- Zenn (E. G.) *The Neuter Plural in Latin Lyric Verse*. (Language Dissertation No. 42.) Pp. 20. Baltimore: Linguistic Society of America, 1949. Paper.

rt and
Lon-

Schule
, Heft
Paper,

ic and
xford:

uchbe-
rderer
,) Pp.
DM.16.
, 106.
net.

Testa-
latine
Partis
Iacobi,
oistulas
30-405.
is. net.
Lyric
Pp. 20.
1, 1949.